DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 780 EA 024 470

AUTHOR	Strudwick, Jerry
TITLE	Strengthening Local Education Capacity: Botswana [and] Indonesia. Final Report. Policy Research Initiative.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Univ., Tallahassee. Learning Systems Inst.; Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems Consortium.; Institute for International Research, Inc., McLean, VA.
SPONS AGENCY	Agency for International Development (IDCA), Washington, DC. Bureau of Science and Technology.
PUB DATE	89
CONTRACT	DPE-5823-C-00-4013-00
NOTE	190p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Development; *Developing Nations; *Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Policy Formation; *School District Autonomy
IDENTIFIERS	*Botswana; *Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This report presents information on the Improving the Efficiency of Educational System (IEES) Project Policy Research Initiative, which sought to improve educational capacity at the local level in Botswana and Indonesia. In Botswana, interviews were conducted with approximately 1,450 households and 20 policy makers. In Indonesia, 820 parents, 144 community leaders, 59 headmasters, 60 PTA chairpersons, and 35 village heads were interviewed from 70 public and private schools. Findings indicate that in general, communities, especially rural ones, cannot meet educational costs in excess of existing ones. This raises the question of whether an equitable funding formula can be developed to balance the disparities between rich and poor areas. Given the constraint of extremely limited government resources and lack of a balanced funding mechanism, it is expected that the expansion of the two educational systems will create further inequities between schools, communities, and regions. Six tables are included. Appendices contain status and research reports for each country. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED351780

POLICY RESEARCH INITIATIVE

Botswana • Indonesia

Strengthening Local Education Capacity
Final Report

May 1989

IEES

Improving the
Efficiency of
Educational
Systems

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. L. Messec
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Florida State University
Howard University
Institute for International Research
State University of New York at Albany

United States Agency for International Development
Bureau for Science and Technology
Office of Education
Contract No. DPE-5823-C-00-4013-00

EA 024 470

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IMPROVING THE EFFICIENCY
• OF •
EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

1984 — 1994

Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems (IEES) is a ten-year initiative funded by the Agency for International Development (AID), Bureau for Science and Technology, Office of Education. The principal goals of the IEES Project are to help developing countries improve the performance of their educational systems and strengthen their capabilities for educational planning, management, and research. To achieve these goals, a consortium of U.S. institutions works collaboratively with host governments and USAID Missions. The IEES Consortium consists of The Florida State University (prime contractor), Howard University, the Institute for International Research, and the State University of New York at Albany.

IEES publications are disseminated to promote improved educational practice, planning, and research within developing countries. All IEES publications are held in the Educational Efficiency Clearinghouse at The Florida State University. Current lists of project publications are available. Please send requests for information or project publications to:

Jerry L. Messec, Director
Educational Efficiency Clearinghouse
IEES
Learning Systems Institute
204 Dodd Hall
The Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4041
USA
(904) 644-5442
Telex: 6502682639 (MCI)
FAX: (904) 644-3783

United States Agency for International Development
Bureau for Science and Technology
Office of Education
Contract No. DPE-5823-Z-00-9010-00
Project No. 936-1084

POLICY RESEARCH INITIATIVE

Botswana • Indonesia

Strengthening Local Education Capacity

Final Report

May 1989

Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems Project

POLICY RESEARCH INITIATIVE

STRENGTHENING LOCAL EDUCATION CAPACITY

BOTSWANA INDONESIA

FINAL REPORT

Jerry Strudwick
Institute for International Research

November 1989

Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems Project

POLICY RESEARCH INITIATIVE
STRENGTHENING LOCAL EDUCATION CAPACITY

Country Team Leaders

Botswana

Dr. Patrick P. Molutsi
Dept. of Sociology
University of Botswana
Private Bag 0022
Gaborone
Botswana

Indonesia

Dr. Mohammed Romli Suparman
Balitbang Dikbud
P.O. Box 297 KBY
Jakarta Selatan
Indonesia

Project Coordinator

Jeremy Strudwick
Institute for International Research
Sixth Floor, Suite 600
1815 North Fort Myer Drive
Arlington
Virginia, 22209
USA

(703) 527-5546

6

Table of Contents

Page

1.0 **Strengthening Local Educational Capacity** 1

1.1 Introduction 1

1.2 Policy Issues 2

1.3 The IEES Project 2

1.4 The SLEC PRI 3

1.5 SLEC's Generic Research Design 4

2.0 **Botswana – Strengthening Local Educational Capacity Through Community Involvement** 5

2.1 Background 5

2.2 Research Design 7

2.2.1 Theoretical Framework 7

2.2.2 Research Questions 8

2.2.3 Sampling 9

2.2.4 Data Collection 10

2.3 A Summary of the Critical Findings 10

2.3.1 The Parent Subsample 10

2.3.2 Family Spending Patterns 11

2.3.3 CJSSs, the Community, and the Partnership Policy 12

2.4 Discussion of the Findings 14

2.5 Conclusions and Recommendations 16

2.5.1 Conclusions 16

2.5.2 Recommendations 18

3.0 **Indonesia – Strengthening Local Educational Capacity** 19

3.1 Background 19

3.2 Research Design 21

3.2.1 Theoretical Framework 21

3.2.2 Research Questions 21

3.2.3 Sampling 22

3.2.4 Data Collection 22

3.2.5 Limitations of the Study 23

3.3 A Summary of the Critical Findings 23

3.3.1 The Parent Subsample 23

7

Table of Contents (continued)

Page

3.3.2 Parents Contributions to Educational Costs 25
3.3.3 Other Types of Support 27
3.3.4 The School and BP3 28
3.3.5 The Role of the Parents 30
3.3.6 Headmasters' Competencies 30
3.4 Suggestions for Increasing Community Participation 30
3.5 Conclusions and Recommendations 31
3.5.1 Conclusions 31
3.5.2 Recommendations 33

4.0 Commentary 34
4.1 Botswana 34
4.2 Indonesia 35
4.3 Communities' Ability to Fund Education 36

Appendices

Botswana

Appendix 1: Phase I - Status Report . . . . .A 1–1
Appendix 2: Phase II - Research Report .A 2–1

Indonesia

Appendix 3: Phase I - Status Report . . . . .A 3–1
Appendix 4: Phase II - Research Report .A 4–1

List of Tables

2.1 Major Characteristics of the Sampled Areas 9
2.2 Ethnic Composition of the Sample by District 10
3.1 Distribution of Parents' SES Scores 24
3.2 SPP (or Equivalent) Fees by SMPT School Type 25
3.3 BP3 School Fees by School Type 25
3.4 Monthly Total Education Costs by School Type 27

Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems Project

POLICY RESEARCH INITIATIVE
STRENGTHENING LOCAL EDUCATION CAPACITY (SLEC)

Included in this report are information on the IEES Policy Research Initiative, and for each participating country, Botswana and Indonesia, background information, summaries of the research designs (each was country specific), an overview of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The report is then concluded with a short commentary that speaks to the policy implications that can be drawn from this research initiative. Attached are a series of appendices that consists of the Phase I Status Report, and the Phase II Research Report from each country.

1.0 STRENGTHENING LOCAL EDUCATIONAL CAPACITY

1.1 Introduction

Over recent years in many less developed countries significant growth in central budget expenditures in the education sector have been accompanied by little evidence of comparable growth in system efficiencies. Evidence from many LDCs indicates that overall education budgets have grown, but in many instances per-pupil expenditures are on the decline. Due to increasing demands on often severely limited national resources, both human and financial, it is becoming increasingly appealing to central governments that they identify areas where there is an existing, or potential, local capacity to absorb additional responsibilities for the support of instructional activities.

What is frequently being observed in education, as in other public sectors of the economy of many developing countries, is a situation that reflects an expanding inability of centralized administration to sufficiently meet the needs and expectations of citizens. To be able to provide the services and facilities that are in demand it may be necessary and desirable for government to increase the level of community participation in varying levels of educational governance, and in doing so move to expand the current, often inadequate resource base for educational services.

For countries that are experiencing an expanding shortfall in fiscal capacity to meet the growth in demand for educational services the problem of identifying appropriate alternate sources of financial and material support is becoming increasingly critical. Of particular interest to both the donor community and recipient countries is the identification of what may be considered non-traditional methods of enlisting local assistance to support instructional activities — rather than the more familiar, clearly defined monetary contributions (fees, education taxes, etc.) although these too are important. For example, many communities in developing nations are already responsible for the provision and maintenance of schools while central government either provides or pays for teachers.

1.2 Policy Issues

If the problem facing governments is how to most efficiently and effectively take advantage of existing and/or potential local capacity to support educational services given current fiscal constraints, then the major policy issues are what alternate policy options exist and what are the political and institutional considerations and adjustments necessary to implement those options. In other words: What alternative forms of community and local support, monetary and non-monetary, are available? How successful have these alternatives been? Under what institutional, and social conditions were these successes measured?

Currently many governments regulate the operation of community controlled and private schools, just as they restrict the level of community/local involvement in the administration and governance of publicly funded schools. An easing or redefining of these restrictions may mobilize additional private and/or community resources without substantially adding, if adding at all, to government's long-term fiscal commitment to this sector.

However, moves towards facilitating the mobilization of local resources, regardless of their form, will almost certainly require substantial political and/or institutional change, particularly where there has been a long standing tradition of free education. It would therefore appear appropriate to identify the alternate policy options and, if possible, some reliable measure of their potential for success in order that policy makers can determine political and institutional priorities.

In order that a meaningful discussion of these alternate policy options can be developed it is necessary that we initially define both the current extent of community and private participation in the support and provision of instructional services, and the institutional framework within which those activities take place. And, secondly, it is vital to our understanding of the possible extent of local participation in instructional support activities that we document the nature and effectiveness of existing examples.

It was with the intent of providing an understanding of local participation in educational support activities that the IEES Project sponsored the Strengthening Local Education Capacity research initiative. By collecting relevant data, contextual background information, and documenting existing funding mechanisms it was anticipated that policy recommendations, and analyses of those alternatives could be made in order that policy makers in the Ministries of Education can select and implement appropriate strategies to develop local capacity to support instructional activities.

1.3 The IEES Project

The central purpose of the IEES Project is to assist participating countries to improve their capacity to conduct research and planning at the central ministry level that would contribute to improved educational efficiency. During Phase I of IEES, the project sponsored three Project Research Initiatives (PRI) on the topics of Educational Management Information Systems, Teacher Incentive Systems, and Strengthening

Local Education Capacity (SLEC). Participation in the initiatives was limited to countries participating in IEES activities.

1.4 The SLEC PRI

At the onset of the SLEC research activities, three countries were actively involved: Indonesia, Botswana, and Haiti. Internal problems caused Haiti to withdraw during the planning stages of the project, leaving Indonesia and Botswana, both of whom completed the entire research agenda. The SLEC research initiative was directed by a Project Coordinator (PC). The PC was responsible for the overall management of the PRI, organizing planning meetings, providing regular technical assistance to the country research teams in the design and conduct of the research, monitoring the progress of the research, and monitoring the use of project resources. The Ministry of Education in each of the participating countries identified Country Team Leaders (CTL), who in turn recruited a research team. The responsibilities of the CTL were defined as: recruiting and supervising the local research team, actively participating in a document review and preparation of an annotated bibliography, identifying and interviewing decision makers in the Ministries of Education, Finance and Planning and other appropriate organizations, preparing project reports, organizing and chairing project workshops/seminars, communicate project findings to relevant national and IEES personnel, and maintaining the projects financial records.

The IEES Project budgeted $50,000 per country per year to support the local research teams. These funds covered the salaries of the research teams, data collection analysis and reporting costs, and expenses related to in-country workshop/seminars. Given the complexity of the IEES-imposed budgetary reporting system, the fiscal management component of the project represented a major capacity building exercise for both CTLs. Expenses related to the PC were funded from a separate IEES budget.

The SLEC PRI was initiated during a planning meeting held at Howard University, in Washington, D.C., during December 1986. During that three-day meeting discussions centered on the goals, products and anticipated outcomes of the PRI. Particular attention was afforded the design of a generic research framework, that could be adapted to the expressed needs of each country. Each CTL was requested to prepare a country specific research proposal to be presented at the second planning meeting.

The second, and final planning meeting was held in conjunction with an IEES International Conference in Denpasar, Indonesia. At that time country proposals were finalized, administrative and managerial procedures reviewed, and a research and reporting schedule for each country agreed upon. A large portion of the Denpasar meeting was devoted to training in research design instrument development and financial reporting procedures. Funded research activities began in both countries in March 1987.

Assistance was provided to the CTLs and their research teams by the IEES Resident Technical Advisor (RTA) in their respective countries. The provision of technical assistance, virtually on demand proved to be an invaluable factor in the success of the SLEC PRI activities. During four site visits, the PC was also able to provide concentrated periods of technical assistance, especially in the areas of instrument and code book design, coding techniques and expenditure reporting. Visits by the PC were, whenever possible, scheduled to coincide with project workshop/seminars, field work, or data analysis.

1.5 SLEC's Generic Research Design

The SLEC Study was designed as a two-year, two-phase project: Phase I concentrating on the preparation of a Status Report, with Phase II taking the form of an extended study of selected aspects of SLEC. The foci of Phase II were determined as a result of an in-country review of the Status Report.

The objectives in preparing a status report were to provide a comprehensive description of local support of, and/or involvement in, educational activities, an understanding of the environment (political, administrative, and social) in which local participation took place, and an indication of the policy research needs that could be addressed in Phase II. It was assumed, at this point, that an understanding of the extent of current regional and local involvement in educational, and education-related activities, and the constraints on and opportunities for such involvement, would greatly assist in defining a valid research agenda for the second phase of the study.

It was also intended that the process of preparing a status report and using that report as a basis for identifying research foci would improve the competence and capabilities of individuals and institutions participating in the project in the areas of policy research design, construction of survey protocols, data collection and analysis, report preparation and project management.

Phase I was required to be a descriptive study that drew upon existing documents and a limited series of interviews to analyze the impact of current policies, regulations and guidelines that affect local participation in education activities. (The Phase I Status Reports are located in the Appendices to this document.)

In addition to the production of the Status Reports (a six to eight month exercise), each research team was required by IEES to produce a thorough research proposal with a comprehensive budget for Phase II. To provide in-country guidance throughout the project each research team had an Advisory Committee that was expected to meet regularly over the project period, review progress, and assist in the selection of the Phase II research foci.

Although the guidelines for the production of the Status Reports were common to both research teams, the focus of each Phase II research project was unique to each country. While that focus remained within the general rubric of SLEC research intent, it was not necessary that it be selected under the condition that it supply the project with findings that were of a cross-national significance. And, as a consequence, the comparison of the two sets of findings reported below for the discussion of their wider policy implication must be done with a degree of caution.

2.0 BOTSWANA – STRENGTHENING LOCAL EDUCATIONAL CAPACITY THROUGH COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

2.1 Background

In common with many governments, GOB committed itself not only to educational expansion at all levels but also to universal primary education in the 1980s. As a first step towards this goal, primary school fees were cut 50 percent in the early 1970s and finally eliminated altogether in 1980. Primary education is universal, though not compulsory; 85 percent of the age cohort are enrolled in school. Continual expansion at the primary level is expected, though the current emphasis of GOB is on expansion at the junior and senior secondary levels.

As secondary education, more than any other level, is perceived by government as being a key to economic development, efforts to increase access and quality have been concentrated there, particularly at the junior secondary level. It was claimed that without adequate personnel trained to a minimum of the Junior Certificate (the first three years of secondary education) development would be hampered as government could not afford to import expensive skilled and semi-skilled labor from abroad.

The junior secondary system expanded rapidly, schools were established throughout the country, some of which were managed entirely by their host communities. By the mid-1970s public participation was so great that MOE was concerned about the possible dangers of an unmonitored expansion of the secondary system. As the National Development Plan for 1970-75 put it:

> "Although secondary school enrollments doubled in the last three years the demand for places far outstripped the number available. As a result many pupils unable to gain admission have turned to self-help night schools organized on a voluntary and private basis... There is a serious problem here, over expansion using inadequate facilities and substandard teachers may lead to chaos, disillusion and bitterness among young people."
> (NDP, 1970-1975:103)

The 1976 National Education Commission (NEC) was certainly the most important landmark in the history of education in Botswana. The commission report made recommendations addressing issues of manpower development, equality of opportunity, social justice and curricular relevance. What is pertinent to the present study is the commission's detailing of the shortcomings of the community management of schools, while at the same time advocating for organized community participation.

Government also accepted a number of the commission's recommendations for reform in the organizational structure of MOE and the education system as a whole. These changes were critical to the policy implications discussed below. Overall, the commission's findings reinforced the expansionist policy, and highlighted the need for a greater GOB commitment and investment in education.

Clearly, GOB has encouraged non-government participation in educational development. Prior to independence some schools where built, financed and managed by the church and/or the community. Although government, in permitting this, regulated private schools, it was not until 1984 that a specific policy on the subject of educational decentralization was introduced.

The Partnership Policy, as the decentralization policy is known, is intended to draw the school and community into a mutually supportive alliance. However, although projected in terms of facilitating the provision of education, this policy is destined to have far reaching macroeconomic implications in other areas of the economy such as employment, migration and the provision of services to rural areas. It is, in fact, a critical vehicle for rural development in Botswana. The policy has three main components: it reiterates GOB's education objectives through to the year 2000; it details the advantages of community involvement; and it defines the undertakings and obligations of the participants in the policy.

GOB's education objectives for the 1980s and 1990s are:

- to provide a nine-year basic education for all (to be realized by the mid 1990s);
- to ensure that schools are staffed by qualified teachers, and, as a necessity, to expand teacher education;
- to expand vocational education and to establish vocational training centers;
- to vigorously pursue the National Literacy Program; and
- to ensure the efficient running of the education service as a whole, to decentralize educational management as much as possible to District Education Centers.

What is new, and to some extent radical, about these objectives is the emphasis put on both curriculum reform and community participation. GOB articulates the following reasons for involving communities in the financing and management of junior secondary schools (the order below reflects GOB priorities, and it is interesting to note that financial contribution by the community is mentioned last):

- to make the community responsible and committed to the efficient running of the school,
- to enrich the curriculum by incorporating local variations,
- to reduce the distance between home and the school (removing the need for hostel accommodation at the school),
- to allow the community access to school facilities, and
- to encourage the community to share in the cost of providing secondary education in the country.

Government, as one of the partners under the policy, undertakes to provide the Community Junior Secondary Schools with the following:

- buildings, including classrooms, library, teaching areas for science, home economics and other applied subjects, administration blocks and toilets;
- furniture and equipment for the above;
- a qualified principal and teaching staff, paid by MOE;

- up to 50 percent of the housing required for the staff;
- a subsidy of P. 40 (this was raised to P. 80 in 1987) for each pupil, to a maximum prescribed by the Ministry; and
- for schools in very remote areas boarding hostels for pupils.

In turn, the community is required to provide:

- a Board of Governors to manage the school "in accordance with government regulations;"
- a school site, cleared, and ready for construction;
- ancillary staff for the school (bursar, secretary, etc.);
- maintenance for all school properties and equipment;
- cooking area for the preparation of school lunches; and
- accommodations (rented or owned) for teaching staff.

The policy does not define community, nor is it at all clear what the term is to be taken to mean. In practice, "community" has been made synonymous with the "catchment area," or with a group of villages served by a school. This lack of definition is often an additional source of discontent, as topics such as school siting (i.e., in which ward or village should a school be located) a normally "hot potato" in any political arena, are worsened by the absence of clarity in official documents.

The Partnership Policy is not supported by specific legislation. At present, earlier legislation designed for the self-help schools of the 1970s, is the closest article to a legal footing the policy has. School principals, meeting in 1988 stipulated that new legislation was urgently required that would adequately address the concerns of headmasters, Chairpersons of Boards of Governors, and district authorities. Interestingly parents and communities were not included as interested, concerned parties.

A final, though critical, point concerns the extent of regulation by government. Many stakeholders including education officers, teachers and Boards of Governors feel that there are far too many "dos and don'ts" included in the wording of this policy. The expressed belief, on the part of the educational practitioners was that little increase in community participation would take place under the policy, unless it is structured under more considerate guidelines.

2.2 Research Design

2.2.1 Theoretical Framework

In order to focus and sharpen the analysis in this research, the study employed a simple model, the **opportunities and investment participation model** (see below). The model is primarily dependent on one key assumption: That a community will choose to behave rationally; i.e., it will work to maximize the returns to the community, in the form of quality education, if attractive investment opportunities to engage its energies and resources are available.

The Opportunities and Investment Participation Model

Opportunities		Investments		Quality of Schools
* Resources * Policy	Permit	* Personnel * Community	Enhance	

Disincentives such as disadvantageous admissions policies, will reduce community investment in the school, while incentives such as a curriculum that encourages student assistance in community projects, will increase it. In this context GOB provided incentives are attempts to increase the opportunities for individuals and host communities to invest for their enhancement. An intention of the study was to better understand the dynamics of community investment. The rationale being that a community will influence the quality of its local school to the extent that its inhabitants are investing their own resources of time, energy, and funds in what they see as opportunities for economic, social, and political improvements that are available to them.

Two constraints on investment were considered; one, policies which set parameters on potential investment, and two, resource availability that would limit investments.

2.2.2 Research Questions

The overall objective of the project was to identify specific areas where there is evidence that local and/or private participation in the provision of educational services has led to, or has the potential of leading to, a determinable increase in the quality of those services. Structuring this intention within the framework outlined above, eight primary research questions (or blocks of questions) were addressed:

1. Are there identifiable regional, local, or community related factors that contribute significantly to an increase in community participation?
2. What policies encourage such participation and what policies discourage it? And, are there areas of current policy which need revision?
3. What resources in the community are available for continued investment in the schools? Are these renewable, and at what rate?
4. What types of community investment prove most effective? And, what are the communities' investment and expenditure patterns?
5. To what extent does social stratification, level of literacy and geographical location of community encourage or discourage participation in education development?
6. Are there attitudes, official and/or semi-official, which discourage or promote community participation in educational development?
7. How can the coordination and dissemination of information within the educational system be improved?
8. What forums exist for current and future policy review debate?

2.2.3 Sampling

Due to the physical and social variation found in Botswana, the research the team adopted a sample design determined by geographic location, ethnic composition, village population size, degree of village isolation, and type of schooling present.

Households surveyed were selected employing a systematic sampling technique. The sample was not altered from its natural composition; i.e., parents, teachers, school administrators, community leaders, extension workers, resident foreigners, etc., all represented. There was no requirement of having a child at school, and all were eligible for interview if they were either the head of the household or their representative.

Table 2.1

Major Characteristics of the Sampled Areas

Name	Description	Pop.	Location	No. of CJSSs
Gaborone	National Capital	87,346	Eastern	5
Serowe	Headquarters Central Dist	31,010	Central	4
Molepolole	Headquarters Kweneng Dist	25,000	Western	2
Kanye	Headquarters Southern Dist	24,570	Southern	3
Francistown	Oldest Town	37,759	Northern	2
Good Hope	Small Village	1,841	Southern	1
Sikwane	Small Village	1,090	Eastern	1
Mahalapye	Herero Ward	n.a.	n.a.	1
Letlhakeng	Med. Village	1,684	Kaglagadi	1

Table 2.2
Ethnic Composition of the Sample by District

Village/ Town	Tswana	Herero	Kalanga	Other African	Asian	Other Nat'l	Total
Gaborone	413	2	24	25	4	30	498
Francistown	113	3	114	19	3	4	256
Serowe	173	–	9	–	–	–	18
Molepolole	197	–	–	4	–	1	202
Kanye	190	–	–	2	1	2	195
Good Hope	28	–	1	–	1	1	31
Mahalapye	14	24	–	–	–	–	38
Letlhakeng	1	–	–	31	–	–	32
Sikwane	9	–	–	–	–	–	9
Total	1138	29	148	81	9	37	1443

2.2.4 Data Collection

The main method of data collection was the interview. An instrument was prepared, field tested, and appropriately modified, and then administered to a total sample of 1,450. A modified interview schedule was administered separately to 20 policy makers in the Ministries of Education, Finance and Development Planning, and Local Government and Lands. An emphasis was also put on direct observation and the documentation of qualitative data that might help the interpretation of the interview results.

The researchers also talked with community leaders and politicians and attended community kgotla meetings. These interviews served as points of cross reference for some of the observations made during the study's primary interviews.

2.3 A Summary of the Critical Findings

Summarized from the Botswana Final Research Report (see Appendix 2) and a reanalysis of the data provided by the Botswana research team.

2.3.1 The Parent Subsample

Ethnicity and Geographic Distribution

In Botswana, as elsewhere in Africa, certain ethnic groups more readily accept formal education than others. This is especially true of the Hereros (situated in the North West) who as pastoralists put cattle tendering skills before formal education of a child, and of the BaZezuru group who prefer blacksmithing to education in its formal sense.

A number of respondents insisted on being identified as Batswana and nothing else – 31% of those resident in an Herero ward claimed to be Tswana – though they may be Tswana there appears to be a tendency to distort ethnic origin.

Data analysis and general observations suggested that the smaller villages were better informed and organized to participate in school activities. Residents of the capital city, however, claimed ignorance of many issues, and reported that they are not approached to help the CJSS in their area.

Education

Expectations of the influence of respondents education on community support were: One, the better educated in the sample would put a value on education and be more concerned with the factors that affected their childrens' education and the efficient running of their community's school, and two, that uneducated, illiterate parents would be committed to supporting the schools that their children attended in order to influence their life chances. In other words all households would be receptive to, and be willing to participate in activities that stem from the GOB's Partnership Policy.

An individual's education did not appear to be a significant factor determining participation or support of CJSSs, although comparatively well educated communities displayed higher levels of participation and contribution. Education was, however, considered important when selecting member of schools' Boards of Governors. Somewhat in contradiction, however, it was found that a number of relatively well educated people were either bitterly opposed to the composition of the school boards, or they refused to contribute to the school because the board was chaired by what they termed "illiterates."

Age and Gender

In Botswana the extended family plays an important role in family welfare, a significant number of households have as their breadwinners the younger and better educated members, and as such they are the ones who pay household expenditures, including school fees. Therefore, it was not surprising to note that almost 40 percent of the respondents were under 30.

Over two-thirds of those interviewed were female. This was most probably the case either because women have been noted to participate more in community and government development programs than men – they are usually the household members who are not formally unemployed – or, because in the more traditional households education related matters are the responsibility of women.

2.3.2 Family Spending Patterns

The National Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES), completed during the same period as the SLEC study, reported that urban and rural average monthly incomes were P. 505 and P. 136 respectively. Average monthly expenditures for the same regions were P.419 and P.112 respectively. As there is no reason to suspect that there has been any significant change in these patterns, it must still hold that there is, quite simply, little disposable income in the average household.

The HIES also reported household expenditure figures for the period that ended just prior to the introduction of free secondary education. Overall (urban and rural) household expenditures were: Food (29%), Drink and Tobacco (14.5%), Household Goods and Services (14.0%), Housing (13.3%), Communication and Recreation (13.1%), Education (8.3%), Clothing (5.6%), Medical (2.3%), and all other expenditures (3.9%). At present the impact on household expenditure patterns of the free education policy is not known, nor, in reality, is what the policy actually means when it speaks of "free" education. There is, however, no expectation that all education related costs will be borne by government.

2.3.3 CJSSs, the Community, and the Partnership Policy

Officially the Partnership Policy represents an agreement between a community and GOB; schools are a joint venture in which both the government and the community have specified responsibilities. The theoretical position adopted in the study was that communities are rational actors; i.e., they will act in a manner that will maximize their returns and benefits, given a sound reason to invest; in this case returns and benefits are primarily defined in terms of education, service by teachers and students to the community, community access to school facilities, and the provision of employment opportunities. The assumption, therefore, is that if the CJSS has a role to play that benefits both the individual family and the greater community, then members of that community will actively support it. And, by extension, if the government policy is to improve these schools, then the community will support such a policy.

The critical concern is information flow: What information do community members have about the community's schools and government policy? Almost 60 percent of the sample had no knowledge of the Partnership Policy. Out of the remainder less than two percent got their information about the policy from government publications. Roughly 20 percent got their information at the village kgotla meetings. Less than ten percent had heard about the policy from more than one source.

It was also evident that community members had little knowledge of the workings of the schools' Boards of Governors. One quarter of the sample knew that the boards' role was to assist in the management of the CJSS, another quarter did not know that the community was represented in CJSS management, while almost half of those questioned did not know of the existence of school boards.

The majority of the sample had no knowledge of what the curriculum contained (even in very general terms), the state of school facilities, teaching materials, sports facilities, school accommodation, quality of teachers, and attitudes of the headmaster and teachers to the community. Some concern was expressed over the lack of hostel accommodation, and this, as expected, only by parents.

Communities were, however, quite familiar with schools' general reputational factors, most often measured by performance in external examinations. Two-thirds of the respondents were able to rate examination results, though of those one-third thought that they were unsatisfactory.

The Role of the CJSS

The role of the CJSS, as perceived by the sample, revealed two interesting clusters of responses; only half thought that the role of the school was to provide access to secondary education, while in response to a second item almost two-thirds did not think that a function of these schools was to prepare children to serve their community.

Providing Support to the CJSS

Only 45 percent reported being asked to assist the school in their area, and the majority of those were asked to help primary schools: Less than 20 percent had ever helped a CJSS, and that was almost entirely in response to requests from either teachers, the headmaster or their own child. Most other persons who are responsible for mobilizing community resources for the school (the chief, the MP, the PTAs, and the Boards of Governors) were not instrumental in raising assistance. Of those that did assist the local CJSS almost all gave either money or their labor, and reported that they could give more. Participation in school activities was, again as one would expect, closely linked to having a child at that school.

CJSS and Community Involvement

The current CJSS is a new institution for most communities, and as such has not yet participated in the development of their host communities. Moreover, there are no clear indications that they will do so in the future. Teachers and students, as well as parent communities, still largely perceive these schools as "centers of learning" and as nothing else.

CJSS and Private Sector Support

A stakeholder in education not adequately addressed in the Partnership Policy is the private sector: The role of business and commerce (which plays an increasingly important part in Bostwana's development) is not specified, nor are there guidelines for that sector's participation. The expectation is that this is an oversight on the part of GOB. In the past, much of the funds for the construction of CJSSs have come from businesses both inside and outside the school's host community. In reality, what are often referred to as "community" contributions appear to have come largely from the private sector.

CJSS Boards of Governors

The pressure on the local leadership, and the absence of a large pool of literate people at a local level, combined with local political struggles have resulted in the establishment of ineffective, inexperienced, and less educated Boards of Governors. Their input to the management process at the CJSS is marginal at best. As they are currently constituted, these boards cannot be expected to make any substantive input into the school management process. Headmasters reported them to be a nuisance, as they do not attend meetings and are sometimes needlessly uncooperative.

Administrative Issues

District education personnel are currently overburdened with their primary education duties. Further responsibility connected to CJSSs will result in a reduction in the amount of time they can allot to their primary school duties. In addition, they are currently ill informed about the both Partnership Policy and the workings of the CJSS system.

Political Issues

Membership of the Boards of Governors are contested along party lines, and a defeated party is not likely to support the school. This, when coupled with the fact that the local Member of Parliament or his representative is an ex officio member of the board has caused this potential mechanism of school management to be highly political.

2.4 Discussion of the Findings

Resource Availability

A primary purpose of the study was to assess the availability of resources within communities, and the communities' willingness to invest those resources in education.

It was clearly evident that the average Botswana family has little, if any, disposable income. This is particularly true of rural families that rely upon the production of livestock and crops for their entire livelihood. Six years of drought have, in effect, reduced their resource base (both as individuals and as communities) to a minimum. As in many cases the depletion of their cattle post assets has been dramatic.

Observations by the research team, apparently confirmed by other recent studies, confirmed that poverty was widespread in all regions visited. The HIES reported that in 1986-87, 50 percent of urban households had incomes of less than P. 341, while the same percentage of rural households had incomes of less P. 161. With incomes as low as these, and with education being, nationally, the sixth priority in family expenditures there is no evidence that lends support to the expectation that additional monies can be freed up by a large portion of the population to support education. Although both the SLEC survey and the Central Statistics Office HIES study were conducted in drought years and therefore may exaggerate the household unavailability of resources, it is clear that the general absence of disposable income is a major constraint limiting community support to schools. And, even though students are receiving free education they are still paying, directly to the school, for various types of construction, support staff, meals, etc. It should not be overlooked that families are all but required wherever possible to contribute to other community development projects. If these are projects such as rural health, water supply, or drought relief, it may well be the case that they are viewed as being far more critical than CJSS support.

The majority of households may have been relatively poor throughout Botswana's entire period of educational expansion, but through various means communities have managed to fund education, though this no longer seems to be a viable option for school support. Local leaders indicated that just as communities were short of private monies, local councils are also unable to continue to provide local resources for education. Primary education is now totally financed by central government as councils can no longer meet even part of the cost (all district councils are now regularly operating under budget deficit conditions).

Neither families, host communities nor local authorities appear able to regularly raise substantial funds to support the CJSS system. And, if, as expected, the contribution per school from GOB is reduced in real terms, then the reality can only be that this will cause there to be a significantly negative affect both on the quality of schools and schooling. One consequence will most likely be a derailment of GOB's efforts to improve access to secondary education.

The task at hand, if communities are to provide renewable resources to education, is to develop a means of providing, locally, through a sustainable activity, a regular source of income that can be devoted to education.

Policy Formulation

The formulating of education policy in Botswana begins with consultations at the Kgotla, Village Development Committees (VDCs), and Parent-Teacher Associations (PTA) level, and following a path of refinement or modification, the policy issue under debate is reviewed by the local authorities, District Councils, Land Boards and the District Commissioners. Once this process is completed, discussions are continued at the Ministry level, and there, depending on the issue, the Ministry may also consult with the private sector, including religious organizations. At the third and final stage, the policy issue is debated in Cabinet and then in Parliament – where it most probably originated as a member's motion.

Had the Partnership Policy been developed following this model a few critical omissions could have been avoided by GOB. There was inadequate consultation with the communities, only a very limited dissemination of information regarding the policy took place, and there was no clearly articulated consideration of development activities that are currently in place at the local level. The rather too rapid introduction of the policy also contributed to a general sense of confusion that found even the District Commissioners having to address CJSS matters with inadequate materials and information on the imposed system.

A concern often raised, though not a 'fault' of the policy implementation process, is the political turn that educational administration at the CJSS local level has taken. Many politicians regard the introduction of Boards of Governors as a legitimate forum in which to express and advance their political goals, a fact that educators reported was to some extent undermining the school management process. On a more positive note regarding board members, MOE workshops are conducted for members of Boards of Governors, and they, as a consequence of their funded attendance, are now beginning to develop the skills required to meet their responsibilities.

Effectiveness of the Education System

Indications are that parents and community leaders are becoming increasingly concerned about the ineffectiveness of the school system. In a video report in which the SLEC research team participated, parents, teachers and community leaders expressed serious reservation on the number of children who complete primary and secondary school but enter the workforce ill prepared. They recommend more practical subjects to be included in the curriculum, and they said more technical schools are needed at a post junior secondary level.

2.5 Conclusions and Recommendations

2.5.1 Conclusions

On the basis of the data gathered and the results of the Survey of the Household Income and Expenditure Survey, we can safely conclude that for the foreseeable future local cash resources (both family and community) will remain very limited. As a consequence it is not expected that either households nor local authorities will have adequate funds to invest in education.

Mean incomes for the urban and rural households are P. 687 and P. 256 respectively. Looking at that from an income inequality perspective, in Botswana 80 percent of the population share just 28 percent of total cash income. (In the United States, 80 percent share 42 percent of the income.) As such a large number of the population are at the lower end of income scale, and it should be noted that that scale is not nearly so broad as it is many developing countries, it seems highly probable that any increase in cash contribution to the CJSSs would have to come from a small segment of the population. Although 20 percent of the sample did already contribute to their CJSS, and indicated that they could give more (all from the better educated categories, and therefore one would suppose, the higher earning categories also) it is entirely unreasonable to anticipate that such a small group of the population, almost entirely urban based, could sustain funding at a high enough level to meet possible CJSS community contribution expectations.

Other than financial contribution, whether occasional or in a formalized regular manner, the only other real options for communities to provide support are material (cattle, crops, products, construction materials, etc.), labor, family support (assisting by paying costs related to their extended family), and moral support. As discussed earlier in the report, irregular, and often extended, droughts dismiss any expectation of schools being supplied, or even being able to raise their own crops, and cattle, etc. Although there is no reason why communities cannot work with the school either by providing products whenever possible, or by providing guidance and assistance in crop and cattle care, the provision of materials (particularly farm related) cannot be looked upon as sustainable source of indirect revenue.

Excluding membership of schools' governing boards, which is addressed later, actual use of community labor is limited by not what actually needs to be done at the school, but by what skills are available in the host community. So, in reality, we are best speaking of low level maintenance, repairing desks and chairs, cutting grass, clearing land, and other menial tasks. Not exactly the tasks that community members willing participate in. This author's own experience in African schools, leads him to believe that it is usually groups of students who are "grouped" by the school to complete these tasks, as communities, particularly urban ones, will not participate unless paid the going rate for that type of labor.

Hence, until local economies have diversified and output has increased on a consistent basis, the local resource base will remain narrow and susceptible to a wide range of external influences. And, as community support reflects the health of the local economy, the CJSS will for the short-term at least remain very much dependent on central government subvention.

Given the general low levels of education in the country, members of the schools' Boards of Governors are on the whole less educated than would be minimally desirable, and as such their contribution to school management remains marginal. The GOB workshops to improve board members skills in this area will over time improve the quality of their input into the school governance process. However, if the length of their terms as governors are short, or their attendance at meetings remains as occasional as it was reported to be, the value of GOB efforts will be lessened.

Lack of knowledge about the partnership policy raises several questions relating to GOB's chosen methods of communicating with the population. What was especially disconcerting was discovering that a large number of teachers, civil servants, and politicians were not conversant with this policy. Officials of the Ministry of Education, however, believed that communities were consulted in the process of designing the policy; a fact that strengthens any question concerning GOB's internal information flow.

The study team's questioning in this area does, however, seem to have precipitated some action, as it was reported that the Minister would address Kgotla meetings regarding the Partnership Policy sometime in the near future.

Communities consider the Partnership Policy a brainchild of the central government. It is seen as being divorced from GOB past actions, then government supported a number private schools (generally mission owned) where the management was left to the owners and government played no role in the CJSS enterprise except through legislation and partial funding. The current restructuring of GOB participation is new to communities. The question arises as to whether they are willing to, or have already, accepted this imposed innovation. If the answer is yes, then questions need to be raised as to why communities appear reluctant to support these schools. A critical point here is that there is an apparent reluctance to support the schools, and that this is most probably closely related to a general confusion surrounding GOB's commitment to what to many appear to be two conflicting policies. The "Free" Education Policy, and the

Partnership Policy have resulted in a situation, attributable to either misinformation or no information, where the public see themselves being asked to support, either directly or indirectly, CJSS instructional activities while being assured by government that there is now free secondary education.

2.5.2 Recommendations

The Partnership Policy is now in place, and under it support structures and, to some degree, guidelines have been created. There is a need now to strengthen the overall CJSS institution, to reorganize and to coordinate the schools with the declared, and necessarily, funded intention of improving their overall quality and performance. More definition is required as to what local councils, communities and the private sector are supposed to do vis-à-vis central MOE and government. The revision of the 1978 Education Act is long overdue. GOB education legislation needs to be clear, elaborate, and definitive on CJSS ownership, funding, and management issues.

The gap that exists between the CJSS and the community is largely attributable to a leadership vacuum. Community leaders including chiefs, councillors, members of Parliament and local and central government officers appear not to be adequately motivated. If change is to occur and communities are to consistently take an active role in providing resources for their CJSS, then this vacuum must be eliminated, for without proactive, solid, and reliable leadership in this venture at the community, local, and national government levels, the intent of the Partnership Policy is destined for failure.

Community Junior Secondary Schools need to do much more in the area of practical activity to attract community attention. They could produce and sell more vegetables, repair some simple farm and household implements in their workshops, mount vegetable and crop production workshops for members of the community through their 4H clubs. They could also have open days and occasional evening public lectures on issues of relevance to community development. Through, in essence, these simple tasks, the visibility and community confidence they could create are at this stage essential to establish, at the very minimum, a sense of community involvement, and hopefully ownership.

The provision of affordable (free) education (at least to central government) was intended to improve access and provide every citizen the opportunity to realize their potential. Thus, if there is to be a continual expansion of the system (qualitative and quantitative) it must exhibit, perhaps through the harmonization of school and community and the better use of education resources, a concern for equity. In terms of population, Botswana is a small country. Disparities inter- and intra-schools will be obvious and cause community division, something that runs contrary to the intent of national policy.

There is a need for a National CJSS Association of Boards of Governors, as such a forum could promote training and information exchange among its membership. It may also be necessary to review the current legislation on the constitution of the boards. Consideration should be paid to dropping ex officio membership rights, including teacher representation.

The Ministry should also consider developing Regional Education Offices for Secondary School Affairs, appropriately staffed by an education officer trained in secondary school administration and system supervision, middle-level educational administrators, and support staff. Currently there is insufficient non-central MOE support for secondary education, both junior and senior, and without that mid-level district specific mechanism central government will become increasingly distanced from an expanding system.

3.0 INDONESIA – STRENGTHENING LOCAL EDUCATIONAL CAPACITY

3.1 Background

Since the beginning of Repelita I (the first Five-Year Development Plan) in 1969 a large number of changes have taken place in Indonesian education. Throughout the last twenty years, education policy has focused on both increasing access to schools and improving the quality of schooling, though the emphasis until recently was firmly on the former of these objectives. There has been reform in curricula, improvements in preservice and inservice teacher training, a concentrated effort that focused on the construction of school buildings (Inpres), an ongoing increase in the provision of school facilities, and textbook programs included in GOI's drive to support, through education, the goals of national developments. The most recent of these improvements is perhaps the most far reaching: In early 1989 a new National Education Law was drafted.

The new Education Law (Undang-Undang Nomor 2, 1989) provides a basis for simplifying the rather complex system of Indonesian education. The law outlines a centralized education management system for all levels of education within MOEC. However, within that centralized system some administrative and management functions will be delegated to local units of MOEC. The parameters within which ministries and the private sector can participate in the provision of educational services are more clearly defined, and institutional responsibilities defined.

Two critical policy changes are reflected in the new law that, once implemented, will radically change the shape of Indonesian education over the coming decades. These are:

- a Nine-Year Basic Education cycle (NBE) which in principle adds the current three-year Junior Secondary (SMTP) cycle to the six-year Primary (SD) basic education cycle, and
- a local content component to the National Curriculum. Localities now have the authority to determine the content of up to 20% of the curriculum. The "local" component is supposed to reflect imposing local conditions.

A comparison between the existing situation and what facilities and manpower will be required to implement these policies (particularly NBE) brings to light a number of potentially debilitating obstacles that will need to be addressed prior to GOI being able to institutionalize an extended basic education cycle.

The availability of education personnel is a major concern. It is planned that regions will be required to determine the additional number of teachers required, as well as to training and placing them.

Currently, these concerns have been the responsibility of the central government (MOEC). For example, assuming that all SD graduates will be absorbed into SMTP, between 1986/1987 and 1993/1994 Central Java will need an additional 53,164 teachers, an average of 6,645 teachers per year. If the current rate of transfer from SD to SMTP continues, estimates are that the province will need only 12,171 new teachers, or an average of 1,739 teachers per year (estimates include a 2% attrition rate among teachers).

The projected need for additional Junior Secondary school teachers in the province illustrates that unless there is an adjustment to the funding polices that effect the educational budget, it will be extremely difficult to implement a NBE that will absorb all SD graduates in SMTP.

Recent experiences in curriculum reform have caused MOEC to regard teacher inservice training as an absolute must. However, the current, centralized inservice training model is lengthy, and costly, and at present is not geared to absorb the large number of teachers requiring additional training.

The projections of the number of new classrooms needed to accommodate all SD graduates by 1993/1994 presents quite a challenge to school planners: In Central Java for example, 23,846 additional classrooms will be needed (2,650 per year). In Riau, 329, and in NTT 340 a year; needs estimated on the basis of student-classroom ratios of 50, 53, and 53 respectively. If the projections were based on current rates of transfer between levels, Central Java, Riau, and NTT would need 1,095, 233, and 236 new classrooms per year respectively. If the ratio of students per classroom is lowered to the regulation 40, then the number of additional classrooms required increases dramatically.

In order to minimize the cost of new teachers and classrooms, alternative methods of using available resources (manpower, money and materials) need to be identified, and tested. Attaching SMP to SD schools, and employing double and/or overlapping shifts are two such alternatives. To increase access to SMP for the students in remote places other types of schooling may have to be developed, as will more effective methods of providing and distributing textbooks and teaching materials to these areas.

Addressing the problems outlined above, among others, will require an increase in the resources allocated for education by the government. However, the capacity of central government to support further system growth has declined in recent years. Government does not have the additional funds necessary for the improvement or expansion that will be required for NBE to become a reality, and may not even have enough for to support a preventive maintenance program throughout the current system. Nor is it singularly able to provide the necessary motivation and incentive structure to ensure in-school improvement. Consequently, if a nine-year basic education cycle is truly regarded as a key element in Indonesia's development strategy, GOI will need to focus on the identification and efficient use of non-government resources for NBE.

The Strengthening Local Education Capacity (SLEC) study was directed toward identifying methods of enhancing regional capacity to support education, particularly as policies and support structures are adapted and adopted in the light of the requirements of the new education law and the implementation of NBE.

3.2 Research Design

3.2.1 Theoretical Framework

Education in Indonesia, as defined in the Guidelines for State Policy (GBHN), is a cooperative venture between government, community and parents, its quality and product should, therefore, depend on the efficient use of the inputs provided by these three sources.

Observations have shown that parents' and communities' moral and material support to teachers, headmasters, and other education personnel, and a willingness on the part of schools to take the initiative to raise the standard of the education they provide, have created a wider expectation of an improved quality of schools and schooling (Suparman, 1988; see Appendix 3). This theme is pivotal to GOI's policy of expanding local (family and community) responsibilities for education.

The main theme of the Strengthening Local Education Capacity study is to identify mechanisms that may raise local capacity, especially that of parents and communities to support education. The following assumptions are made in regard to this study:

- That one's motivation in an activity will increase if the activity fulfills one's life needs (material, physical, or social-psychological). And,
- That one's sense of responsibility will increase if one feels that he/she participates in deciding the activity they are to be involved in.

3.2.2 Research Questions

The strengthening of local capacity to fund, participate in the management of schools, and to enrich education programs are all regarded as important, and as such are being addressed by MOEC. The study attempted to identify influences that affect local capacity to support education in this wider sense, with emphasis on:

- Factors that influence parents, community, and local government to participate in the quantitative expansion and the qualitative development of SD and SMP.
- Functions, authorities, and responsibilities which are can be delegated to the local units of MOEC, parents, communities, and other local government offices in order to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of "local" schooling.

From these intentions four broad research questions were offered:

1. What kinds of contributions are provided by parents, communities and local government offices to primary and junior secondary education?
    a. What kinds of contribution, general or unique are made?
    b. When and how often are those contributions made?
    c. How long can those contributions be expected to continue?

2. What factors are related to the degree of parental and/or community participation in SD and SMP?

   a. What aspects motivate and constrain this participation?
   b. What is expected by parents or communities for their participation?
   c. What effect does the degree of participation have on the school?
   d. Are there any teacher, school principal, or supervisor attitudes which support or hamper the participation?
   e. What policies, regulations, or mechanisms support or hamper the participation?

3. What functions, authorities, or responsibilities could be delegated to local units of MOEC, parents, communities and other local government offices in order to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of local schooling.

4. What methods of information sharing and coordination will bring parents and communities closer to schools in order that they would increase their support activities?

3.2.3 Sampling

A multistage sampling technique was used to select respondents:

- Two provinces, Central Java and Riau (Central Java representing the larger and more densely populated provinces, and Riau the smaller provinces).
- Three districts were selected from each province, the capital district, the largest and the smallest (in terms of area and population).
- Two subdistricts were then randomly selected from each district.
- In each subdistrict two public and one private SMP, two public SDs, and an MI (religious primary school) were randomly selected.

From each subdistrict 5 to 6 schools (consisting of 2 public SMTPs, 2 public SDs, 1 private SMTP, and 1 private Madrasah Ibtidaiyah) were randomly selected. As not all subdistricts had the types and number of schools required, only 70 out of the possible 72 schools were included in the sample (21 public SMPs, 15 private SMTPs, 25 public SDs, and 10 private MIs).

Lastly, twelve pupils (randomly selected), the headmaster, and a BP3 Chairperson were identified for each school. Four social leaders were also chosen randomly from each village where a sampled school was situated. The total sample was as follows: 820 parents, 144 community leader, 59 headmasters, 60 BP3 (PTA) chairpersons, and 35 village heads.

3.2.4 Data Collection

To gather data the following research instruments were developed, field tested in Central Java, and refined:

- Interview schedule for parents and community leaders
- Interview schedule for headmasters
- Interview schedule for village heads
- Interview schedule for BP3 chairpersons
- Forms for collecting secondary data on school characteristics

Provincial offices of MOEC and Bappeda (Regional Planning Office) in Riau and Central Java were requested to identify research personnel as interviewers. They are deliberately chosen from the sample provinces in an attempt to enhance local MOEC competence in research. Each researcher completed interviews and collected secondary data from schools in a sampled subdistrict (from 5-6 schools in 2-4 villages from a total of 72 respondents). Data collection was completed in November 1988.

3.2.5 Limitations of the Study

The research design adopted for this study is post-hoc in nature and therefore cannot be expected to determine a conclusive relationship between the independent variables and the degree of local capacity to support education activities. The study involves only limited samples from two provinces, a small fraction of a vast and heterogeneous research population. In addition, the junior high schools (SMTPs) studied are limited to SMPs (general junior high schools). Therefore, even though the sample is taken randomly within the provinces, any generalization of the study's findings should be made in context.

3.3 Summary of the Critical Findings

Summarized from the Indonesia Final Research Report (see Appendix 4) and a reanalysis of the data provided by the Indonesia research team.

A total of 1,132 were drawn from 38 villages, in 12 subdistricts from 6 districts Riau and Central Java. The sample consisted of 820 parents (of SD, MI and SMTP children), 144 local community leaders, 65 headmasters, 33 village heads, and 60 BP3 chairpersons.

3.3.1 The Parent Subsample

Geographic Distribution

Four hundred and twenty-six came from Central Java, 394 from Riau – two were not included in the parents data analysis as they were included as community leaders. Distribution by subdistrict is detailed in Table 1 of Appendix 4.

Age and Gender

The youngest respondent was 20, and the oldest 75; the parents of children from public primary schools (SD Negeri) were, on the whole, younger than other groups. The sex of the interviewed parent was not recorded.

Education

The educational background of the majority of respondents was low, 65 percent have some formal education below the level of SMTP graduate; i.e., less than nine years of schooling. Surprisingly, only eight percent of the sample had little or no education (less than two years of schooling).

Socioeconomic Status

SES was determined by employing an aggregate index of variables based on wealth, education, family possession data and savings. There was wide variation among the total sample. Table 3.1 shows that SES distribution is relatively normal. However, SES of those parents whose children attend MIs and private SMTPs (SMP Swasta) is lower than that of those who attend public SDs (SD Negeri) and public SMPs (SMP Negeri). The vast majority of those with an SES score of over thirty, resided in urban areas.

Table 3.1

Distribution of Parents' SES Scores

SES Scores	Frequency
9	\\\3
10	\\2
11	\\\\\\\\\\10
12	\\\\\\\7
13	\\\\\\\\\\\\\13
14	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\29
15	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\35
16	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\30
17	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\37
18	\\\49
19	\\\47
20	\\\53
21	\\\55
22	\\\55
23	\\\45
24	\\46
25	\\40
26	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\37
27	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\38
28	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\31
29	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\25
30	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\30
31	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\21
32	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\18
33	\\\\\\\\\\\\12
34	\\\\\\\\\9
35	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\15
36	\\\\4
37	\\\\\\6
38	\\\\\5
39	\\\\4
40	\\2
41	\1

Occupation

By occupation, the breakdown was: kuli – part time blue collar (11.6%), factory worker (11.7%), farmer without land (4.8%), farmer with land (17.5%), self-employed (14.0%), civil servant/military (27.4%), managerial (3.1%), and unclassified (10.0%).

Family Size

Forty-five percent of the respondents have more than 4 children, the average number of children per family being 3.5.

3.3.2 Parents Contributions to Educational Costs

Contributions were defined as: Monies paid directly to school, BP3, teachers, student organization (OSIS) for the purpose of education of the student in the study, or money given directly to the student in the form of daily allowances. These contributions were classified as either routine and obligatory, incidental and voluntary, daily allowance, and entrance. Data on the fees/costs related to textbooks and writing materials were not collected.

Routine and Obligatory Contributions

This category includes SPP fees at public SMTPs, BP3 fees at public SDs and public and private MIs, and the OSIS fee at SMTP. Most of the private SMPs do not have SPP and BP3 fees, rather they have one school fee. The size of these public school fees are decided by the school according to provincial and district regulations, and should be paid by parents every month. In the analysis, the private SMPs school fees were treated as the equivalent of SPP fees.

Table 3.2

SPP (or Equivalent) Fees by SMPT School Type

School Type	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
Public SMP	756.4	168.9	248
Private SMP	4497.9	2003.0	166

Table 3.3

BP3 School Fees by School Type

School Type	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
Public SD	417.4	314.9	293
Madrasah	864.9	604.7	111
Public SMP	2222.4	168.9	248

There are no BP3 fee charges at Private SMP schools

33

The data revealed there is almost no difference between the amount of SPP and BP3 fees paid by the parents of public school students (due to the fact that the SPP and BP3 scales used are developed for each subdistrict and are not related to ability to pay). However, across subdistricts it was evident that private schools' parents pay much higher school fees (SPP and BP3 combined in the case of public SMP) than do public schools' parents. Parents in remote areas (mountain areas, and small islands) in general pay smaller school fees than other parents. As one would expect, the higher fees were of those schools in urban areas.

Public SMP SPP fees ranged from Rp. 650 - 1000, and BP3 fees from Rp. 1300 - 3300. BP3 fees for SD and MI vary from Rp. 100 - 1500. All fees are per month. MI fees were reported to be higher than SD fees, though total monthly costs were higher at SD schools (see Table 3.4).

Incidental and Voluntary Contributions

Contributions in this category include activity and special fees (materials for skill training, payments for sporting activities, school excursions, arts education, testing services, and school examination fees for the highest grade), and any additional cash contributions paid by parents to cover incidental needs of the school, and BP3. All these fees are voluntary in the sense that their imposition is governed by the student's wish or need to participate. These fees are usually paid directly to the teacher, and often the contributions do not show up in the school bookkeeping. Half of both public and private SMP parents reported paying less than Rp. 250 per month in these fees.

Daily Allowances

Two sets of costs were included in this category, pocket money and transport costs. These daily allowances vary from Rp. 0 - 3700. Twenty-two percent of SD students and 34 percent of MI students go to school without a daily allowance. Fifty-two percent of private SMP and 64 percent of public SMP students get between Rp. 50 and Rp. 250 per day.

School Entrance Fees

These fees are paid by new students entering the school. The fee usually includes an enlisting charge, a building contribution fee, a school uniform fee, and an entrance examination fee. The building contribution is paid as an additional BP3 contribution per new student. Schools ask parents to pay on a credit basis over a three to six month period. Parents may pay up to (and in some urban cases in excess of) Rp. 100,000 in entrance fees.

Most of public schools do not collect an enlistment fee, though most of the private schools do. The highest in the sample was Rp. 9,500. Some public school parents reported paying a combined enlistment and examination fee, though this is against the law. Only a small number of schools, public or private, collect uniform fees.

Adding all monthly contributions (excluding entrance fees) we arrive at the monthly contribution figure (see Table 3.2). The data indicate that private school SMP parents have a higher monthly education cost than do public school parents, while Madrasah parents pay slightly less than public SD parents.

Table 3.4
Monthly Total Education Costs by School Type

School Type	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
Public SD	5193.6	5021.7	293
Madrasah	5002.1	4595.9	111
Public SMP	9235.7	10034.5	248
Private SMP	11110.0	6793.7	166

Headmasters and BP3 chairpersons reported that they believed that BP3 and SPP fees were already at the maximum parents could afford. This, in fact, may be the case if that maximum is based on GOI regional fee scales. However, if it is taken from the perspective of parents' ability to pay, the data indicated that this was not the case. Data show that the income and SES of the parents varies a great deal, but as the amount of SPP and BP3 contributions are uniform, and are being met by the poorer parents, then this could be interpreted as illustrating that those parents in the higher income brackets could pay more.

Even though quite a number of respondents indicated that the regulation amount of BP3 and SPP contribution was sound and fair, 41 percent of parents indicated that the fees should be adjusted. The majority of parents and community leaders expressed the belief that if BP3 fees were increased, then, in turn, the quality of the school and schooling would increase.

3.3.3 Other Types of Support

Only one-third of all parents reported that they ever contributed in any other way than the payment of fees. In the majority of those cases parental assistance was being the school in the form of direct labor, repairing furniture. Almost two-thirds of the community leaders also gave their labor to repair school equipment.

Potential Contributions from Parents and Communities

There are several other types of contribution that parents are willing to make, that when combined would result in substantial community participation. These include: donated manpower (offered by 98 percent of parents and 94 percent of the community leaders), occasional cash donations (46 percent of parents, 54 percent of leaders), additional routine donations (7 percent of parents and 11 percent of leaders). Twenty-five percent of parents indicated their inability to contribute more money, though they could contribute their labor.

Community Contributions

Cash contributions from the community as a unit are rare. Only two of the sampled schools reported receiving monetary contributions from the local business organizations. Villageheads confirmed that villages contribute more in kind than in cash; they donate land, furniture and equipment. In Riau's remote islands villages organized their communities to build housing for their primary school teachers.

Indications are, from most areas, that the community mechanism of 'gotong royong' (self-help) in education which was strong before the First Pelita is now virtually nonexistent.

School Based Income Generating Activities (Swadaya Sekolah)

A small number of schools earn income from school based activities, though in each case the cash amounts raised were very small, and were used for teacher's welfare.

The generation of income by the school is hindered by an MOEC regulation that bars schools from earning from activities, unless that income is submitted to the state treasury. Recent developments at MOEC seem to suggest that this policy may eased to permit schools to organize income generating activities.

3.3.4 The School and BP3

Sixteen percent of parents and 37 percent of community leaders evaluated school conditions (school cleanliness, furniture, and school equipment) as 'good.' The research team's observations of school facilities revealed that public SMPs tended to be better than private SMPs, and SDs tend to be better than the MIs.

The BP3 role as a partner of the school was evaluated as 'good' by 73 percent of parents and community leaders. BP3's role as a fund raiser and representative of parents was evaluated 'good' by only 35 percent of parents and 50 percent of community leaders.

Management of Funds

Financial data provided by headmasters and BP3 chairpersons was far from complete. However, the existence of the School Budget Plan (RAPBS) for schools, though at present not widely used, is an encouraging development. RAPBS if correctly taught and subsequently supervised, will make the school and BP3 more accountable, and will provide a record of all the school's financial transactions. In general, the management of school fees (SPP and BP3) is inadequate, and as a result it is rare that the maximum use is made of these scarce resources.

The survey data indicate that operational costs in public schools, including teachers salaries, come from central government and parents. While in private schools almost all operational costs are paid by parents' contributions (school fees). The role of the private schools' Foundation Organizations (Yayaysan) is marginal.

The points listed below, were drawn from discussions with headmasters, BP3 chairpersons and village leaders:

- BP3 funds are usually spent on school building maintenance, furniture, and furniture repair.
- SPP funds are not available for use by the school to respond to immediate needs, they are forwarded to GOI for redistribution to schools, and the amount received after that redistribution is decreasing.
- BP3 usually delegates the management of its funds to the headmaster, who in turn often delegates it to a teacher.
- Schools and teachers lack the facility to obtain funds for additional operating costs. An SD regulation concerning free education is interpreted by parents to mean that are free of any obligation to pay for schooling, other than non-teaching-learning activity fees.
- Many headmasters do not know how to spend funds wisely. They have received no training on fiscal management techniques.

Attendance at BP3 Meetings

Participation in BP3 meetings was reported as low. Only 31 percent of parents attended meetings more than once. An activity scale (that includes attendance at BP3 meetings) showed that only 13 percent of all parents participated in more than 3 events. There was no significant difference between the participation rates of private and public school parents, though private school parents were slightly more active on the schools behalf.

Participation at BP3 and School Activities

In-depth interviews with headmasters, BP3 chairpersons, and community leaders revealed that parents who most often participate in BP3 and school activities are not the wealthy parents. However, it was reported that parents who have a better education and hold higher occupational positions tend to more readily support the school in a material sense. The parents who are not active in BP3 meetings and/or do not contribute, reported that they do not do so because they are waiting for the headmaster or community leader to ask for their assistance.

According to headmasters and BP3 chairpersons, the success in increasing parental participation is through good public relations and regular meetings. However, one-third of the parents that attended the BP3 meetings thought that the BP3 leaders gave scant attention to members opinions.

Headmasters and BP3 leaders expressed a believe that increased parental and community participations would only come as a result of an increase in school quality.

3.3.5 The Role of Parents

Parental involvement in the classroom is very rare in Indonesia, and as a consequence it was not a surprising to see little support from headmasters and teachers concerning the mobilizing of parents to assist in classroom activities.

Sixty percent of parents indicated that their role in the education process was one of helping the child to study at home, while the school's responsibility is in-school education. The role of school's host community was reported by the large majority of parents as one of helping students appreciate their environment.

Home Visits

Sixty percent of the headmasters interviewed stated that they had made home visits during the last academic year. A review of the reasons for the home visits, however, did not reveal that the visits were a vehicle for developing a relationship between parents and the school. They were usually in response to a problem and were always formal. Many parents reported that they saw the need for home visits by the school staff.

3.3.6 Headmasters Competencies

The absence of school management skills is evident and as such should be addressed by MOEC as soon as possible. It is thought that managerial skills are necessary, especially as schools turn to their host community requesting increased participation in school resource provision. The most outstanding absence in this area is found at the primary school level, where virtually no school management training has been received by headmasters.

Concerning the need to increase competencies: Headmasters hoped that additional authority would be given to them to organize activities in collaboration with extension units and other community based organizations. Their wish was to be able to make decisions concerning school fund-raising activities, and to be given wider responsibilities to organize curricular activities that will allow them to introduce creative and innovative teaching-learning activities.

3.4 Suggestions for Increasing Community Participation

Even though roughly half of the respondents, 44 to 54 percent of each group (parents, headmasters, BP3 chairpersons, and village heads) evaluated BP3 as being useful and necessary, and the management of BP3 funds as being open, they still asked that BP3 be more receptive to members needs (45 percent of the total sample). Headmasters, BP3 chairpersons, and village heads coupled this suggestion with the need for more information on the schools to reach parents. The belief was that these approaches would assist in improving the school's image in the community and through that process improve community participation.

Based on the descriptive and qualitative analysis of data collected the following summary comments are made:

- Data provided by the schools and BP3 concerning their finances is incomplete.
- When the Rupiah amount of school fees are set, no provision is allowed for consideration of parents to pay. School staff are in favor of a simplified "means test" approach to setting school fees.
- The willingness of parents and community leaders to give non-monetary contributions is not taken advantage of by either the schools or BP3.
- Public schools are mostly attended by children from wealthier families.
- The majority of the non-monetary contributions to either the school or BP3 are from those less wealthy parents with little or no education.
- The willingness of parents to contribute is affected by their assessment of the way that those contributions are managed, and by their perception of the effectiveness of past contributions in increasing childrens' education.
- There is a positive significant correlation between the parents' assessment of the school, their participation in BP3, and their willingness to contribute.
- Individual approaches to parents by headmasters, teachers, and community leaders are expected by most parents at all school levels. However, evidence does not indicate that this is a common practice.
- At the neighborhood and village community levels, joint activities in the context of community development are an effective approach to establishing ongoing community support.
- The headmaster as a figurehead has not yet become the motivating factor in increasing the quality and quantity of parental and community participation in school support activities.
- BP3s limited their fund-raising to approaching their own members.

3.5 Conclusions and Recommendations

3.5.1 Conclusions

GOI needs additional operational funds to implement NBE, particularly as they are committed to maintaining current quality standards. However, it is not realistic for MOEC to anticipate any substantial increase in the level of financial support from parents or communities as a whole. The capacity of parents to contribute is in most cases extremely limited. Concerning SDs and MIs that are now fee-free it is politically difficult to introduce a requirement that the education costs, or part thereof, be borne by the parents. A practice that will be even more difficult in SD Inpres schools, where parents consider everything as free, as that was part of the Inpres promise for the "Sekolah Presiden" (The President's School — all of which were built with GOI funds under Presidential Decree).

Financing a compulsory NBE will most probably require a similar GOI mechanism adopted to finance the compulsory education (SD) movement. Government will be obliged to erect additional Sekolah Inpres and to free the "new" SMTP student from school fees as it is difficult to demand compulsory education, and then to force people to pay for it in the form of direct fees. Therefore, it appears that government (central and/or local) must increase their allocations to the education budget. From one perspective, such an increase is logical, since the expansion of NBE is the will of government, and not the expressed will of the people. However the GOI argument for a directed effort to enhance parental and societal participation in education support activities, as the Broad Outlines of State Policies (GBHN) clearly states, the responsibility of education lies in the hands of government, parents, and community.

If the GOIs moving toward the universalization of NBE follows the same pattern as the universalization of SD, then it is to be expected that familiar problems will arise in its implementation. For example, the schools' difficulties in collecting new fees from parents. Also, if fund raising is to continue through BP3 then the management of school finances and BP3 fees must be made into an accountable action. The spending of BP3 monies through the Yearly School Budget may be a suitable mechanism for this. Headmasters and teachers should be released from administering BP3 fees, and BP3 organizations and their members should be given the opportunity to participate more actively in the schooling process. Without some level of participation in the governance process, coupled with some tangible evidence of an increase in the quality of schooling, there can be little incentive for parents to be any more involved than they are at present.

Almost every school reports having difficulties in the administrative procedures that revolve around the use of SPP fees. A mechanism is urgently required that will permit schools to spend the funds they collect at will, though under both guidelines and an umbrella of accountability. The study also revealed that the determination of the amount of school fee and BP3 fee is not equitable if the fee levied is considered from a socioeconomic perspective. There is no difference in the amount of SPP and BP3 fee paid by those parents from high or low SES backgrounds, nor is there any differentiation between the fees paid by parents with one or seven children. If the school fees at the SMTP level are required for the NBE program to be successful, then MOEC must institute regulations that will alleviate what may well become impossible fiscal pressures on some families. In addition, it is critical that local government be permitted to raise funds for education. GOI policies should more clearly express the role of each level of local government in relation to the use of education monies from a societal source (e.g., land and house tax (PBB)).

The analysis of the data collected in this study revealed that the level of parental and societal participation in educational support activities are determined by their perceptions of the capability of the headmaster, BP3 leaders, and teachers. Many parents report that they are waiting for a request to provide support to the school, but there is little evidence that they will support an institution that does not hold the promise of functioning at what they regard as a near optimal level, both from a management and curricula perspective.

The study also revealed that the effective implementation of NBE will require some delegation of authority from the central units of MOEC to the school. A system of school-based management and micro-planning should therefore be given serious consideration, as it is becoming increasingly difficult for the central and local MOEC bureaucracies to effectively manage the rapidly growing number of schools. Without such changes central MOEC will be grossly overburdened and as a consequence unable to manage the NBE implementation process. However, it is recognized that a change in this direction will require a large revision of existing regulations and management mechanisms at all levels.

3.5.2 Recommendations

1. Strengthening the local MOEC capacity to implement NBE
   - A deconcentration rather than a decentralization of authority from MOEC central units to MOEC local units.
   - Rather than a centrally based enhancement of fund-raising activities, the authority for provinces, districts, subdistricts, and the schools themselves to determine their fund-raising and community support strategies.
2. Strengthening Local Education Capacity
   - The strengthening of community participation in education should start with a building of the communities confidence in the school management and the quality of the schooling that is taking place. This should be approached through the enhancement of headmasters' competencies. Included are:
     - ability to liase between schools and parents,
     - school management skills,
     - simple educational planning skills,
     - competencies in utilizing out-of-school resources for planning and school management,
     - competencies to work toward an enhancement of school quality, and
     - competencies in mobilizing parents as resource persons.
   - The strengthening of parental and general community participation should be approached formally and informally through recognized social leaders.
   - The management of education finances should be modified to permit schools:
     - wider authority to spend the funds that originate in their community, and to account for their fiscal activity through the School Yearly Budget Plan;
     - to determine, under regulated advisement, the amount of parental contributions (school fees) required; and
     - authority to raise additional funds through school sponsored activities.
   - Because of the importance of basic education for nation building, its primary budget should be borne by GOI. The calculation of GOI support should be based on unit costs per school, in terms of per student, per program. The unit costs per student, per program should, within certain guidelines, be uniform.

4.0 COMMENTARY

4.1 Botswana

Botswana has long had community and mission funded schools, though not great in number, the model they provided has played a pivotal role in the development of current education policy. For the African child, prior to independence, the community school represented his only source of education. Post independence, the government funding of secondary education expanded, and what were previously the pride of neighborhoods and villages, the Community Junior Secondary Schools (CJSS), became the least sought after formation of postprimary education. Based on the earlier pre-independence CJSS, the CJSS of the mid-1980s became the school of last resort. Government, government-aided and private schools produced students with better external examination results at a more efficient rate to GOI: In 1984, the cost of producing a Junior Cambridge graduate at the government-aided school was 3.9 years of investment compared with 12 years at the CJSS (see F. Kemmerer, *The Role of Local Communities in Improving Educational Effectiveness and Efficiency in Developing Nations*, 1989).

Recently, GOB introduced the Partnership Policy (PP), an instrument designed to stimulate further community involvement in education. Under this policy GOB found a mechanism that would, by parcelling out components of the necessary funding to host communities, permit it to keep its commitment for an expanded and reorganized system. The new 6-3-3 system would have as its center a network of similar schools based on the established model of partially funded CJSSs. At the same time a second education policy was introduced, the thrust of which, at least as it is seen by the public, is the provision of free education. Though this is not the actual intent of the policy (tuition-free education is) the impression is that it is, and that, when coupled with the PP has caused confusion, and more importantly, doubt and mistrust. Community concerns are: What exactly is the government proffering? What is role of the community, both short- and long-term?

Though the requirements of a community under the PP are clearly stipulated, they were not at time of introduction articulated to communities through the traditional channels, the village kgotla meetings, nor were they formulated in the usual "bottom-up" manner. Consequently, the PP was not understood. Likewise "free" education, as a policy of government, is neither understood in its intent or implementation.

The PP was not based on adequate information regarding already existent community participation in development activities (activities that are already stretching a number of drought striken communities), nor did it reflect an understanding of what communities could, or could not, afford. The partnership being advanced by GOB was neither negotiated nor agreed upon. Instead, it was proposed by the central government, implemented by ill informed local government personnel, and as such has faced resistance and distortion, both of which could have been avoided.

42

The name CJSS is old, and is still most usually associated with the earlier (though in the not so distant past), poorer schools and with the children of poorer households. However, on the brighter side, under the PP the CJSS is to cease being a "white elephant," the school of last resort. Undoubtedly, this reflects a positive change in attitude toward the CJSS on the part of government. In the past CJSSs were notorious for poor performance, slack attendance, and for having the worst teachers. The CJSS of today usually resides in a new building, and is the process of establishing its image in its host community. Reports from previous IEES RTAs in Botswna are that the performance of most CJSSs in the past two or three years has been impressive, and that this has probably made positive impressions on the schools' host communities.

Successful implementation of public policy is dependent on information flow, both prior to, and following the introduction of policy to the practitioners. The absence of a participatory role in the policy formulation process, and the attendant confusion caused by being the silent partner in the reestablishment of what was the community institution delayed, and may continue to delay, host communities from supporting what is for all intents and purposes their only opportunity for access to postprimary education. The application of the model proposed by Molutsi in this research activity, the opportunities and investment participation model, perhaps captures best the point of this commentary: The public will participate, and usually to the best of their ability, in opportunities to improve their status — though they will not participate if the terms of their investment, and the potential returns on that investment are, not clearly articulated.

4.2 Indonesia

As the Indonesian government gears its development plan (Replita VI) towards what is frequently referred to in the local press as "the industrial take-off period," the emphasis that is being placed on preparing an adequately educated workforce is commendable. The government's dependence on public participation through the payment of school fees, etc., for the successful implementation of an extended basic education cycle, and thus, a means for that development, appears, however, to be somewhat optimistic on their part. If, as a review of GOI budget projections over the next twenty year period seems to indicate, there is little, if any, additional monies for education then it is clear that NBE cannot be implemented in the near future without the imposition of additional fiscal burden at the local level.

In universalizing primary education, government was obliged to resort to SD-Inpres, a national, GOI-funded drive to provide free education to those who were unable to attend schools. This program instituted a tradition, and subsequent expectation, of free, or almost free, education at the primary level. GOI could not, at present, afford to repeat that gesture at the SMTP level. Currently, total primary school fees are, on average, 50 percent of the corresponding fees paid at the junior secondary level (see Table 3.4). And, as all indications are that the extent of new school facilities, and that the number of new teachers, etc., that will be required to implement NBE, even on a province by province timetable, will so severely impact on GOI's education budget there will be no option other than to charge that expansion directly to the family.

Whether that charge is in the form of taxes (property or other local) or in the shape of school fees will be of little consequence to the vast majority of Indonesian households, each of which, statistically at least, will be impacted by the additional cost.

If the assumption is made that GOI will go ahead and incrementally introduce NBE, and that communities will be asked to fund part of that expansion, questions then arise as to how schools will change (in terms of cost, quality, composition of enrollments, management and public utility) and how communities can best adapt to those changes. An expansion of this magnitude has not taken place within any government sector in Indonesia before. There is no experience as to how to lessen its expected negative impact on community and family resources. The structural change that NBE will cause to the village work force is but one example. Almost all rural Indonesian communities depend to a great extent on the use of older children and young adults at every stage of their crop and livestock production, and in their daily commerce.

Because of the diversity of what is Indonesia, it is necessary that GOI permit communities to address their own concerns in the expansion of educational services. Determining their level of monetary participation will occur de facto. The allowance of community participation in the ownership and governance of schools, and the determination of the role that schools play in their communities are perhaps at this stage of the country's growth, and under the governments fiscal constraints, the only real options remaining under which GOI can fund NBE.

4.3 Communities' Ability to Fund Education

The findings of both sets of research reported in this study are unanimous on one point: In general, communities, particularly rural ones, are unable to meet education costs in excess of those already imposed on them. In each case about one-fifth of the sample either indicated the ability, or was judged to have the ability, to pay an increased education levy, and almost without exception those families were resident in urban areas.

Can an equitable funding formula be reached that will permit those that can afford monetary contributions to be exploited, while at the same time accounting for those poorer communities that have little other than their labor to offer? Under the constraint of extremely limited government resources, and without the imposition of such a balancing mechanism, it is to be anticipated that the further expansion of the two systems under inquiry may well result in that expansion being the source of further inequity between schools, communities and regions.

APPENDICES

Page

Botswana

Appendix 1: Phase I Status Report A1-1
Appendix 2: Phase II Research Report A2-1

Indonesia

Appendix 3: Phase I Status Report A3-1
Appendix 4: Phase II Research Report A4-1

Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems Project

POLICY RESEARCH INITIATIVE

STRENGTHENING LOCAL EDUCATION CAPACITY

BOTSWANA

PHASE I STATUS REPORT

Dr. Patrick P. Molutsi
University of Botswana

May 1988

Table of Contents

Page

1.0 Executive Summary . . . . A 1–7

2.0 Introduction . . . . A 1–9

3.0 Overview of Education Development . . . . A 1–11

  3.1 The Role of Government in Educational Funding . . . . A 1–14

  3.2 Inefficiencies of the Centralized Educational System . . . . A 1–16

4.0 Local Education Support in Botswana . . . . A 1–18

  4.1 An Historical Overview . . . . A 1–18

  4.2 An Overview of Botswana's Educational Policy: 1966-1984 . . . . A 1–22

5.0 An Appraisal of Botswana's Educational Decentralization Policy . . . . A 1–24

  5.1 Public Reaction to the Partnership Policy . . . . A 1–27

6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations . . . . A 1–28

Selected Bibliography . . . . A 1–35

List of Tables

I Share of Public Educational Expenditure in the Public Budget . . . . A 1–30

II National Income, Public Expenditure and Population Growth (by Region), 1965-1980 . . . . A 1–31

III National Income, Public Expenditure and Population Growth (by Country), 1965-1980 . . . . A 1–32

IV A Typeology of the Organization of School Systems . . . . A 1–33

V General Education Data, 1986 . . . . A 1–34

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Strengthening Local Education Capacity (SLEC) study is a Ministry of Education project and is a component of the Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems (IEES) Project.

The overall objective of the study is to provide data that will support an improvement in the efficiency of Botswana's education system by combining the skills and resources of the government, communities and the private sector.

Financial and technical support for this project is provided by USAID. That funding and associated technical support is provided through the Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems (IEES) Project.

The study is divided into two phases and is conducted by a team of local researchers collaborating with the research experts of the Ministry of Education. Dr. Patrick Molutsi, a sociologist at the University of Botswana, serves as Country Team Leader. The research team is regularly visited by an IEES representative who provides technical expertise as required. In addition, the project has an in-country Steering Committee which advises the research team on matters relating to Community Junior Secondary School Project.

Phase I of the study comprised the first six months from March to August 1987. The main activity during this period was the search and review of locally available literature related to the subject of community finance and management of schools. There were in addition, limited interviews conducted with Community Junior Secondary Schools boards of Governors, headmasters, education officers and selected members of Parliament. The phase was concluded with a Workshop held in August 1987, in which the different stakeholders in education participated.

Although the overall objective of the study is to improve the country's education system, it focuses on the recently introduced Community Junior Secondary School subsector as a case study to determine:
(i) how best communities can be involved in the finance and management of schools, and (ii) if applicable, the most appropriate method(s) of decentralizing part of the educational decision making machinery from the Ministry of Education to local authorities, attention is paid to the potential risk of loss in quality of educational services.

The report that follows is a product of both an extensive, though not exhaustive, literature review on community involvement and interviews with key personalities in education. The workshop held in August 1987 also considerably improved the research team's understanding of the issues under consideration.

In both the developed and developing countries, education is proving to be a very costly investment. Across the board, education costs are high and the sector necessarily competes with other sectors for scarce resources. Many governments have nevertheless pledged to expand their education systems in the belief that the provision of education to most, if not all, citizens is a necessary, though not sufficient, step toward ameliorating the problems of poverty, inequality and unemployment.

Despite governments' attempts and determination, two factors continue to stifle provision of education to the wider section of the population: These are rapid population growth and declined national income. The former in particular, is a predicament of LDCs (less develoed country). In these countries, as Tables I to III in this report show, the number of school-going children increases substantially every year while the overall national income, and therefore the resources available to education, continue to decline.

Moreover, the arguments of the 1960s and 1970s (Shutz, 1960; Harbison, 1960; Todaro, 1985) claiming the importance of investment on "Human capital" or on education as the key to development, have not been borne out by the experiences of most LDCs over the past three decades. Persistent poverty, widening inequality, and the elitist status accorded by education to a few, suggest to the contrary, that rather than being a panacea to social inequality and poverty, education can act as a sieve consolidating and widening inequalities in a society.

One problem facing provision of education in modern times is the centralized bureaucracy. Where governments have opted to be sole financiers of education, strong and inflexible bureaucracies have emerged. These organizations have in recent years inhibited the efficient use of resources in education.

Centralized education systems in developing countries have proved to be both expensive and inflexible to local variations, and somewhat distant from the situation "in the field."

Consequently, many governments have over the past few decades resorted to some form of decentralization (Bray, 1985). Decentralization has become something of a "fashion" adopted by many government systems (Conyers, 1983).

However, decentralization means different things to different people (Rondinelli, et al., 1984). It may be either decentralization, delegation or devolution (see glossary for definitions).

Overall, although currently popular with governments, decentralization has not proved to be a general panacea for the problems facing educational development. It is, however, viewed as an important step that may be required to improve the efficiency of many educational systems.

Botswana has undoubtedly a long history of community participation, itself an important attribute of a decentralized system. However, the history of community participation in Botswana is one of setbacks; setbacks which have not been adequately addressed in the literature.

A careful review of this history illustrates that for future policy purposes, community involvement should be carefully monitored rather than taken for granted. Moreover, some critical inputs to past community participation (e.g., a strong chief and tribal competition), have been removed by the present conditions that exist in the countryside. This tends to suggest that future community participation will require revised premises and perhaps more appropriate methods of inducing support.

Botswana has embraced the policy of educational expansion as the cornerstone of her development program. From the time of independence the government has expanded education facilities at all levels.

Along these lines, and in light of expanded educational opportunities, the government introduced a decentralization policy in 1984. The Partnership Policy (PP), as it is known, defines the roles of government and of communities. Although geared to facilitate the provision of nine-year basic education, the policy is intended to substantially contribute toward improving the performance of the entire education system in Botswana and, though indirectly, to contribute to rural development.

The PP has obvious shortcomings, among these, a lack of clarity regarding the roles of religious organizations and the private sector. There is currently an absence of legislation to support the policy.

Public reaction to the PP is, to date, negative. Several communities feel that they were not adequately consulted when the policy was decided upon. Others claim their schools have been taken from them to serve objectives different from those for which they were built.

Communities which are in agreement with the policy argue that government is expecting far too much from them. They claim that their resource base is such that it is not possible to make the substantial contribution apparently required of them.

One of the main objectives of the PP is to bring the school closer to the community. The host community is expected to assist in the management of the school, provide some of the support services and participate in the development of an appropriate curriculum. Teachers feel that, on the contrary, community involvement is a frustrating invasion of their profession.

Policy makers and administrators, particularly at lower levels, are not convinced of the merits of community involvement and are concerned of its possible negative impact on school quality.

Notwithstanding the foregoing critical views of the policy, the SLEC workshop held in August 1987 concluded that the policy was a crucial step forward. It then recommended a thorough research on the issues involved.

These recommendations included:

- an assessment of community investment patterns estimating how much of these resources are available for educational development;
- an assessment of the potential contributions of the churches and the private sector;
- an investigation of the administrative and management potentials of local authorities stating the types of decision making categories that can be delegated to regional education offices; and
- an assessment of the manpower and other implications of establishing regional education offices on the central government.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The Strengthening Local Education Capacity (SLEC) study is a Ministry of Education/IEES Project, which began in March 1987. The primary objective of the two year study is to provide relevant data, background information, systematic procedures, recommendations and analysis of policy alternatives so that policy makers can select and implement appropriate strategies to develop and strengthen local capacity to support education activities in Botswana.

The objectives of current government policies are clearly to strengthen local education support by encouraging popular participation. The study will continue to address the subject of policy formulation, but more importantly will concentrate on the implementation process of existing policies. Thus, the main goals are specifically to:

- identify the best ways and means of involving communities and other stake holders in the financing and management of Community Junior Secondary Schools (CJSS) in Botswana, and
- to assess the manpower and other resources implications on GOB of the present policies on educational decentralization.

The study consists of two phases. Phase I, of which this report is the product, was intended to provide a comprehensive description of the current local/community support/involvement in education, and an indication of policy research needs in this area. Phase II, the SLEC field research activity, will focus on a topic identified in this report and be further clarified by the project's Advisory Committee (AC).

This Status Report (SR) is the product of an extensive literature review on community participation in educational development in developed and developing countries with a concentration on Botswana. The report also reflects the input gained from limited interviews and discussions with senior government officers, community leaders and teachers. During Phase I, members of the AC – composed of education officers, headmasters, university lecturers and researchers, and chairmen of the school boards of governors – met twice to deliberate on the issues relating to finance and management of schools in Botswana.

Phase I concluded in a workshop held at the end of August 1987 in which all stakeholders in the system – government, religious institutions, private organizations, communities and the teaching profession – were represented. Feedback indicated that the study was progressing well and that the findings and recommendations should assist in systematically documenting the problems facing the CJSS subsystem and suggesting ways of addressing those concerns. Phase I, as was initially intended, served to familiarize the research team with the issues of the research topic.

The SR is divided into four sections. The first speaks of the "pros and cons" of formal education. These perspectives are not particular to Botswana, but are more global. However, the discussion has relevance to Botswana, the subsequent sections of this report, and the SLEC study in general. The second section addresses educational issues in Botswana. It provides short reviews of the history of community support and of education policies showing expansions in the system over the past decades. The third section includes an analysis of the Partnership Policy (decentralization policy) of 1984. The final section of the report consists of the conclusions and recommendations, many of which have been incorporated into the Phase II activity.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT

According to Professor Harbison:

> "Human resources...constitute the ultimate basis for the wealth of nations. Capital and natural resources are passive factors of production; human beings are the active agents who accumulate capital, exploit natural resources, build social, economic and political organizations and carry forward national development. Clearly a country which is unable to develop the skills and knowledge of its people and to utilize them effectively in the national economy will be unable to develop anything else." (Harbison, 1983:1)

Most social scientists share the belief that ultimately the human resources of a country rather than its capital and natural resources constitute the critical determinant of the nature and rate of social and economic development. A great number of positive claims have been made on behalf of the formal educational system which in modern times has become the principal institutional mechanism for imparting skills and knowledge to the human resources of a country (Todaro, 1985). From the perspective of the individual, it is claimed that education produces a well-balanced, perceptive and responsible personality who constitutes an invaluable asset in building a stable and democratic society; again the acquisition of knowledge and skills through education enables the individual to increase his standard of living through improved remuneration (Doob, 1966; Kizerbo, 1966). Education is perceived, however, to confer greater benefits on society than the individual. Todaro (1985) observes that despite the dearth of statistics:

> "...it seems clear that the expansion of educational opportunities at all levels (in LDCs) has probably contributed to aggregate economic growth by: (a) creating a more productive labor force and endowing it with increased knowledge and skills; (b) providing widespread employment and income earning opportunities for teachers, school and construction workers, text book and paper printers, school uniform manufacturers, etc.;
> (c) creating a class of educated leaders to fill vacancies left by departing expatriates or otherwise vacant positions in governmental services, public corporations, private businesses and professions; and (d) providing the kind of training and education that would promote literacy and basic skills while encouraging 'modern' attitudes on the part of diverse segments of the population... That an educated and skilled labor force is a necessary condition of sustained economic growth cannot be denied." (Todaro, 1985:345-6)

As a result of the benefits which education is believed to confer on the individual and society at large, most LDCs, on the attainment of independence, embarked on a massive expansion of formal education. In most of these countries, free and universal formal education became a policy cornerstone of government (see for example Botswana National Development Plans from 1966 to 1991).

Balancing the resources channelled into formal education against the present state of economic and social development in many LDCs, social scientists have began to question the validity of the claims made for education. In many countries, despite the enormity of resources invested in education during the past quarter of a century or so, the economic well-being of the average citizen has shown little, if any, improvement. In fact, in some countries it has declined. Chronic unemployment and poverty are widespread. (It has been estimated by Todaro,1985, that 35% of the LDCs population of 1,232 million people lived in absolute poverty in 1983.)

As a result, claims made on behalf of education have been found to be unduly exaggerated and, in fact in some instances, have been shown to be false (OECD, 1981:49). This view has given rise to the awareness of the following negative claims made for the expansion for formal education in LDCs. While accepting the fact that education has probably contributed to aggregate economic growth in LDCs, it is contended that the "evaluation of the role of education in the process of economic development should go beyond the analysis of a single statistic of aggregate growth." One must also consider the structure and pattern of that economic growth and its distribution implications (Todaro, 1985). This observation becomes even more compelling when one considers the fact that at the moment economists no longer employ growth in aggregate national income alone as an index of development as it used to be the case in the early 1960s.

The abandonment of this single yardstick – aggregated growth in income – as an index for economic development arose from the fact that although most LDCs achieved the growth target of 5-8% in aggregated GNP in the 1960s (set by the UN First Development Decade), it was observed that at the same time there were parallel increases in unemployment, absolute poverty and inequality. This could hardly pass for development. Since then changes in unemployment, poverty and inequality in addition to those in per capita income have been employed to determine whether or not development is taking place in a given society. In this regard, when finding the contribution of educational expansion to development, one has to look at its effects on poverty, unemployment and inequality as well (Seers, 1969).

In the past, because of the use of growth in aggregated income as an index of development, research into the developmental implications of educational expansion focused mainly on its effects on aggregated income and little attempt was made to explore the effect of education on poverty and income distribution. Recent research has demonstrated that, contrary to the conventional belief that expansion in education reduces inequality in the distribution of income, it rather reinforces income inequalities (Bhagwati, 1973). Todaro (1985) puts the argument even more forcefully:

> "The basic reason for this perverse effect of formal education on income distribution is the positive correlation between a person's level of education and his level of lifetime earnings. This correlation holds especially for those who are able to complete secondary and university education where income differentials over workers who have only completed part or all of their primary education can be on the order of 300-800%. Since levels of earned incomes are so clearly dependent on years of completed schooling, it follows that large income inequalities will be reinforced if students from middle and upper income brackets are represented disproportionately in secondary and university enroll-

> ments. In short, if for financial and/or other reasons, the poor are effectively denied access to secondary and higher educational opportunities, then the educational system can actually perpetuate and even increase inequality in Third World Nations." (Todaro, 1985:346-7)

Again, analysis of the factors affecting the demand for and supply of education in the LDCs has shown that expansion in all levels of education has led to growing unemployment. Demand for formal education is essentially a derived demand for modern sector employment and since the modern sector of most LDC's economies are not expanding fast enough to absorb the educated, there is a very keen competition for modern sector jobs. This reinforces the demand for education which further forces governments to increase the supply of education by expanding educational opportunities at all levels. The result is a large pool of educated unemployed in most LDCs. It is estimated that in countries like Bangladesh and Pakistan, graduate unemployment runs as high as 47% (Todaro, 1985). The explosion in the demand for formal education is further reinforced by the constant upgrading by employers of the basic formal education qualifications required for modern sector employment (Dore, 1966).

It is also claimed that the acquisition of educational qualifications does not necessarily enhance one's capacity for productive work. The expansion of education, particularly at secondary and higher levels, involves a large expenditure and hence competition for scare resources with other socially productive sectors of the economy. It is also contended that formal education does not only impart skills and knowledge required for national development, but also values, ideas, attitudes and aspirations which may not necessarily be in the best development interests of LDCs (Todaro, 1985).

Education, especially in the Third World, to the extent that it is oriented to that in developed countries, is often inappropriate to local conditions. Rather than promoting social and political stability, expansion of the education system can produce frustrated, disgruntled and educated unemployed who become the "shock troops of political discontents" (Sanbrook, 1982:172). At the individual level, education or formal schooling cannot always be equated to learning which can make the individual a better citizen. Education, particularly when it is oriented to modern sector employment, as is the case in LDCs, can distort the aspirations of the recipient, leading to frustration.

What has been said above does not imply that education per se is inimical to the development of LDCs. What is implied is that tremendous expansion in educational opportunities in LDCs has brought in its wake certain problems which have tended to raise doubts about the claims made on behalf of the potential contribution of education to the development of these societies. This is partly due to the peculiar institutional and social milieu, especially in LDCs, within which education systems function.

3.1 The Role of Government in Educational Funding

Even more pertinent to the current views on formal education is the question of who finances this (apparently wasteful?) enterprise. Here too opinions differ; some believe that since education has the potential to confer greater social, economic and political benefits on the nation as a whole, rather than on individuals, governments should take the responsibility of making education available to all citizens at little or no cost. The justification for this lies in the fact that in LDCs the widespread poverty of families and households does not make the cost of educating their children easily affordable. In fact, in these societies, children of school age are seen as providing the opportunity for supplementing family income rather than as avenues for the investment of surplus family income. In most instances where the family can even afford the cost of education, the benefits of that education may not be immediately obvious to them and thus they lack the necessary motivation to invest in schooling (UN, 1973).

It is also argued that individual communities in LDCs, unlike governments, do not possess the organizational ability and/or the expertise to provide education (Thema, 1947, on Botswana). Provision of education is seen as an obligation which governments owe their citizens as their birthright (OECD, 1981:52).

Those who take a contrary view assert that education is far too expensive to be left to governments alone; rather the cost should be shared between governments, private agencies and individual households since all benefit from education, though to varying degrees (Psacharapolous,1977). An indication of the cost of education is provided by reviewing the proportion of total government expenditure devoted to education, see Table I. It should be noted that the data in Tables I, II and III reflect aggregation problems; thus they should be viewed with caution. Though, perhaps not accurate, they do reflect the general trend.

Table I shows the share of educational expenditure in the public budget for particular regions and countries for selected years. Column 1 shows the ratio of total educational expenditure (capital plus recurrent) to total public spending. For African countries in the sample, the range is 11.3% for Ethiopia, to 36% for Comoros. The ratio is relatively lower for the East Asia, Pacific, and South Asian regions, and fairly high for Latin America and Caribbean. Column 2 shows the ratio of recurrent educational expenditure to total recurrent expenditure. It will be noted that for any given country, the figure in column 2 is greater than the corresponding figure in column 1. This shows the large recurrent expenditure component of total educational expenditure. It is clear from columns 1 and 2 that total (recurrent) educational expenditure is quite a significant proportion of total public (total recurrent) expenditure.

Table II shows the growth in national income, educational expenditure and population of the school going age group for the periods 1965-70, 1970-75 and 1975-80 for major regions of the world. A comparison of columns 1 and 4 shows that except for East Asia and Pacific where educational expenditure growth fell short of national income growth by 1.1%, for all other major regions the reverse was the case. In fact for East Africa the margin was as wide as 6.4%. This general trend is also true for subsequent periods. A comparison of columns 4 and 7, 5 and 8, and 6 and 9 indicates that for all regions, and for all the periods, the school age population growth fell short of educational expenditure growth — in some cases by a fairly wide margin. In other words only a small growth in the school age population has apparently been enough to induce a more than proportionate growth in educational expenditure.

The relevant data for individual countries included in the various regions are provided in Table III. The data indicate that between 1965 and 1970, of the 45 LDCs for which data was available, growth in educational expenditure exceeded national income growth in 30 (70%) of the countries. Corresponding figures were around 65% for the two succeeding periods. These statistics clearly indicate the high cost of education.

The question which immediately arises is: Can governments shoulder this expansion in educational expenditure alone? Observing the trend in the flow of resources into education, the World Bank notes that between 1965 and 1980, real public spending on education as a share of the public budget has either remained stagnant or declined for most regions of the World — particularly so for the LDCs. During the 1975-83 period, World Bank data show declines of the share of educational expenditure in the public budget from 21.3% to 17.2%, 19.4% to 15.3%, and 16.5% to 9.3% for Cameroon, Kenya and Nigeria, respectively (World Bank, 1986:6).

The explanation for this decline seems to be that educational expenditure has been an obvious candidate for reduction in total government budgetary expenditure in the period marked by two world recessions, 1974-75 and 1980-83 (World Bank, 1986). This was due in part to the high level of educational expenditure attained in the earlier period of educational expansion. There seems to be a clear indication that as the resources available to governments dwindle in the face of poor economic performance and as the inter-sectoral competition for resources intensifies, governments find themselves unable to cope with the demands of educational sector. The question then is: Who should shoulder the responsibility of providing/financing education in a nation?

Given the difficulties governments face in paying for education, there is obviously a need to diversify the sources of educational funding to incorporate other stakeholders, particularly if the current quantity and quality is to be at least maintained. Historically, households and communities, religious institutions and the private sector have always made sizeable contributions to education, both in financial and managerial terms (Commonwealth Workshop Papers, 1985). One school of thought is that currently some subsectors of education are oversubsidized by government, specifically the secondary and university levels. Given the gloomy economic projections for many LDCs, it may seem reasonable for governments to dismantle these subsidies, institute cost recovery measures and provide selective scholarship/bursaries for needy students.

3.2 Inefficiencies of the Centralized Educational System

We shall use, as a point of departure for our discussion of the inefficiency of the centralized educational system, a typology of the organization of school systems employed by Emmanuel Jimenez and Jee Peng Tang, in their article on decentralized and private education (Jimenez, et al., 1987). The typology is reproduced in Table IV. The typology presents the organization of school systems in a two dimensional matrix framework; the vertical dimension delineates two broad "features" of the school system, namely finance and management. Each of these broad categories is further divided into subcategories: Within finance, (i) revenue source, and (ii) method of financing; and within management, (i) decisions on level and type of spending, (ii) fee policy, and (iii) service provision.

Corresponding to each of these subcategories is a spectrum of educational systems ranging from a private model (extreme decentralization) to a centralized model. The entries against the subcategories in the rows describe how they are organized under each system. For example, the first row tells us the revenue sources of the various systems. Reading down the column gives us the various features of each system. For example the last column under "pure centralized model" tells us all the features of this model.

Reading down this last column tells us that a purely centralized educational system is fully funded by the central government (subcategory (i) under finance) and that all the inputs into the schools are provided directly in kind to the schools (i.e., subcategory (ii) under financing). With regard to management under such a system, "decisions on level and type of spending" are set by the central government; no fees are levied (subcategory (ii)), and the government provides standard national curriculum for all schools. It must be noted that the model of a centralized educational system presented is oversimplified and that the subcategories under finance and management are by no means exhaustive. [The adoption of this typology as our basis for discussion is due to the fact that, simplistic as it is, it captures the main dimensions and scope of each model in a neat and comprehensible manner.]

It can be seen that total government funding of the school systems, rather than being a determinant of a centralized education system is an aspect or feature of it. A centralized educational system implies the ownership, management and financing of most schools by the government; under such a system private schools are often either prohibited or restricted by requirements to meet a rigid standard which government-run schools themselves invariably cannot and do not meet. The literature illustrates that while the educational systems of Third World Countries span the spectrum of models shown in the typology, in the past there has been a tendency to centralize educational systems. Currently, there is a trend towards decentralization in most Third World Countries. This change has occurred for a variety of reasons, some of which are discussed later in the SR. For the moment though, we shall confine ourselves to reviewing the weaknesses of the centralized system with a view to providing a theoretical rationale for a decentralized educational system.

A centralized educational system usually means a high financial burden for government and, in a situation where the economy is stagnating and other sectors are competing for scarce government resources, this often results not only in a drop in school enrollments at all levels but also in an inadequacy of physical plant, deterioration of schools, inadequate and poor equipment, and pedagogical materials and teaching staff. Indications are that this is especially true of primary schools in the rural areas. Secondly, in such a system there is usually a disproportionate allocation of resources in favor of higher education, despite the research based proposition that, for LDCs, the social return on primary education is far in excess of that for higher, especially university, education. This stems from the fact that policy makers in a centralized system of education have a vested interest in the expansion of higher education (Jimenez and Peng Tang, 1987).

Thirdly, centralization usually involves a time lag in decision making (i.e., the time interval between a request being made at a local or regional level and the time when a response is received from the Ministry) which potentially has an adverse affect on the teaching and learning process. In his study of the centralized school system in Venezuela, Hanson cites several instances where this time lag spanned several months for certain schools located in remote areas, and cases where responses from central administration never came (Hanson, 1986).

Fourthly, the comprehensive set of regulations that govern the aspects of teaching, learning and administrative processes and the insistence on strict conformity to these regulations introduces rigidity into the system, again with potential adverse consequences. One result of this rigidity is the failure to take account of regional cultural and social differences. The most common example cited is the uniformity of curriculum for both urban and rural schools, a process that does not take account of the special problems of the rural areas, leading to a situation where graduates from rural schools may be inadequately prepared for any useful employment in a rural environment or in the modern urban centers.

Such rigidity stifles initiative and inhibits innovation at the local level. Further weakness in the centralized system cited by Hanson (1986) is what he calls the "psychological distance" between teachers at the local level and decision makers at the center. The decision makers usually lack an understanding of teacher/school problems and this may have an adverse impact on the quality of teaching.

Bray (1985) noted that:

> "(A) review of administrative changes in both industrialized and less developed countries reveals a complex pattern. Some are centralizing, some are decentralizing, some are doing neither and some are doing both. On balance, however, more systems seem to be decentralizing than centralizing – to the point at which Conyers (1983) questions whether decentralization was the 'latest fashion' in development administration." (Bray, 1985:183)

Bray further noted that in most cases these changes in administrative systems were based on dissatisfaction with the status quo rather than a "clear appreciation of the choices open to governments" (Bray, 1985:183). The analysis of a centralized system is made more complicated by the ambiguity in the use of the term. According to Rondinelli, et al., 1984:

> "...decentralization can be defined as the transfer of responsibility for planning, management, and resource raising and allocation from the central government and its agencies to either: (a) field units of central government ministries or agencies; or (b) subordinate units or levels of government; or (c) semi-autonomous public authorities or corporations; or (d) area-wide regional or functional authorities; or (e) nongovernmental private or voluntary organizations." (Rondinelli, et al., 1984:9)

The degree of authority actually transferred varies from situation to situation, thus making it imperative to distinguish between the different forms of decentralization, each reflecting the extent of authority or responsibility transferred. Rondinelli, et al., categorize these forms of decentralization as deconcentration, delegation, devolution and privatization. They observe that these various forms of decentralization have been tried either simultaneously or independently by various countries. (See glossary for term definitions.)

Several reasons have been given for the tendency towards decentralization in LDCs. Some of these reasons are purely political, while others are more substantially administrative. We shall limit ourselves to a brief summary of the reasons employed for decentralizing school systems. First, it is argued that decentralization promotes flexibility and makes it possible to take the peculiarities of different localities into consideration in articulating local needs, hence promoting innovation. It has been shown (above) that inadequacy of educational funding can lead to deterioration in schools and hence quality of school output. It is argued that decentralization can widen the funding base of schools and redress some of the weaknesses resulting from inadequate funding. Thirdly, certain minor and routine decisions taken at the local level can speed up administrative processes and lead to efficient management of schools. Lastly, it is argued that since decentralization promotes participation in decision making at the local level, it makes it possible to enlist local support and enthusiasm in the implementation of decisions (see, for instance, Botswana's National Development, 1985).

4.0 LOCAL EDUCATION SUPPORT IN BOTSWANA

4.1 An Historical Overview

Botswana like many countries has a long history of community participation in educational development. A history that began in the mid-19th century, and has been projected favorably by a number of writers (Schapera, 1943; Swartland and Taylor, 1987). However, our literature review showed that community participation in the finance and management of schools in this country was neither a smooth nor a successful undertaking (Halpern, 1965). While it is not the intent of this author to dwell on the pitfalls of the past, or to discourage present and future community participation on the basis of these shortcomings, it is important to articulate some of the problems of community participation; problems that are not solved by romanticizing the past.

The literature review for this section, was designed to answer the following questions on the history of community and other organizations' participation in educational development in Botswana. Although providing insights for future strategies for community participation, the findings in this section are controversial and inconclusive (a point illustrated by the different views expressed by participants at the August 1987 SLEC Workshop). The questions were:

- Did Botswana communities participate in educational development in the past? If so, why, and who else participated?
- At what level(s) of the school system did communities participate?
- To the extent that different communities participated, what was the nature/form of that participation?
- Were there certain preconditions for community participation? Are those preconditions still evident? If not, what happened to cause a change?
- How do we periodize community participation, and has that participation differed in both form and magnitude over time? And finally,
- Were there any identifiable disadvantages of community participation?

As noted earlier, Botswana has a long history of community involvement in educational development. The first primary school built amongst the Bakwena at Kolobeng was a joint effort of the Missionary David Livingstone of the London Missionary Society (LMS), and the Bakwena community (Sillery, 1952; Swartland and Taylor, 1987). Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, primary schools were built either solely by the church, the community, or a combination of the two.

Some chiefs encouraged their people to go on labor migration specifically to raise funds for construction of schools (Schapera, 1943; Benson, 1960). At that time Tribal Reserves competed among themselves, and a chief would not want to be seen as standing in the way of progress for his people. When asked why their people did not patronize the Roman Catholic tertiary school at Khale in the 1930s, almost every chief said he was encouraging parents to do so. They also claimed that they were helping in the proper maintenance of schools in their villages (Botswana National Archives (BNA) Files No. S.373/4/6/8/9).

Before 1930, most community involvement was voluntary and restricted to the construction of primary schools. However, the decades of the 1930s and 1940s saw a formalized effort to raise educational funds from communities. In 1938, newly established Tribal Treasuries were assigned the task of charging a small fee to each taxpayer as education levy (Coclough and McCarthy, 1980). Little is known as to exactly how much money was raised through the levy. What is clear is that communities continued to raise funds for schools through traditional methods discussed below.

The 1930s and 1940s also witnessed continued efforts by different religious denominations to build primary schools in the villages. Included were the Seventh Day Adventist Church among the Bangwaketse, the LMS among the Bangwato, Bakwena and Bangwaketse, the Dutch Reform Church (DRC) operated the church, hospital and schools among the Bakgatla while the Lutheran and Roman Catholic denominations also used the construction of schools and the hospital to attract converts. In the competition for converts, the churches contributed greatly to primary, secondary and tertiary education in the Bechuanaland Protectorate (BNA File S.373/4/6).

Even after independence the churches continued to make a substantial input into education in Botswana. Mission-founded secondary schools, these were later known as government aided, played a crucial role in manpower development in the early years of independence. Their performance to date remains outstanding.

Apart from communities and missions, isolated efforts to develop viable self-reliant schools were made by individual pioneers such as Motsete, Tshekedi and Isang. Motsete's Tati Training Institute (TTI) founded in 1934 was, however, not a long lived project (Parsons, 1986). The school which was located in the Tati area near Francistown collapsed soon after it started. The primary reasons were both inadequate community resources and lack of support from the Colonial Administration. Tshekedi's school, Moeng College would have suffered the same fate had it not been because of his chiefly position. He put all his energies and authority behind the construction of this – the first community secondary school in the country, the Bangwato Tribal College, which later became Moeng College. In the process community resources were depleted and families were overtaxed by this project (Benson, 1960).

Once again the achievement of the construction of a secondary school through community effort sparked off competitive interests in communities outside the Bangwato Reserve: In 1950, the Bangwaketse opened their own secondary school – Seepapitso Secondary School; a year later in 1951 Bakgatla opened Molefi Secondary School, while Bakwena completed Kgari Sechele Secondary in 1955. These schools, although taken over by the central government immediately after independence, contributed significantly to secondary education in the late 1960s and early 1970s at a time when government had inadequate resources to build new schools. During the same period a new type of community effort evolved in Serowe in the Bangwato Reserve. This time both the wider community and the chief were only indirectly involved in the fund raising effort and administration of the school (Van Rensberg, 1977).

This was a new type of community effort which involved only a section of the community. It was highly reliant on external donor agencies for funding and largely on volunteer foreign staff for teaching personnel. The relative autonomy from both government and community control which the school management enjoyed enabled it to devise and teach a syllabus substantially different from that taught in other secondary schools in the country. It was, in essence, a work-oriented type of syllabus. A limited or complete absence of community participation in the management of the school and in the designing of the new curriculum, however, later proved to be one of the major stumbling blocks to this important innovation because both students and parents preferred the elitist curriculum being taught in government schools (Van Rensberg, 1984; Taylor, 1987).

At this stage we know that the community at large, religious and private organizations, though indirectly, participated in educational development in Botswana from the mid-19th century to the late 1970s. Secondary sources show that throughout recent history, community participation was largely in the form of donated funds, livestock, crops and labor, there was little contribution in the form of school management.

From the time of Livingstone to the present, communities provided money and labor. Both livestock and grains were contributed in lieu of money and these were normally sold immediately. Efforts to engage communities in the management of the schools met with both resistance from teachers and administrators, and fear and reluctance from parents (Thema, 1947). Overall, the whole exercise was a failure (Munger, 1965; Halpern, 1965). It is important to note that community participation has always been insufficient and irregular. (These factors lead one to the assumption that the process of arriving at the present Partnership Policy did not accurately assess potential levels or frequency of community participation.)

Two factors appear to have been critical in past community participation in Botswana. The first is the Colonial Government neglect of, or determination not to support, native education in Bechuanaland while supporting that of local Europeans (Colclough and McCarthy, 1980:30). At the same time the demarcation of the country into Native Reserves whose existence and identity were sustained by community efforts, created an unusual competition that propelled not only educational but also agricultural and physical developments in each Reserve.

The second factor was the role of the chief. Chiefs personified their communities in the eyes of many colonial officers. A 'progressive' chief made his 'tribe' automatically favored (Director of Agriculture, 1956, BNA File No. S.526/4/1). Thus chiefs like Isang, Tshekedi and Bathoen II were well aware that they were competing with their counterparts in the other Reserves. This encouraged them to mobilize their people more efficiently. Moreover, at these early times, and by the nature of the indirect rule system of government, the chiefs had more control of peoples' lives. Evidence suggests that a strong chief was a critical variable in past community participation. Certainly, these two facilitating factors to community involvement are either nonexistent in the 1980s, or are much less potent forces of mobilization than they were before.

The first form of community participation was over the period from the 1850s to 1920s. During this period all efforts were focused on the development of primary schools. There were literally no attempts to construct secondary schools at this stage. Indeed, a significant proportion of households had still to be convinced of the value of education. Many parents preferred to send girls but not boys to school as schooling was associated with light duties only suitable for women (Halpern, 1965).

The second, the 1930s to the early 1960s, was the period of secondary education. Communities and individual citizens made costly and initially unsuccessful efforts to build secondary schools for local communities. These were the secondary schools at the time of independence. These Tribal Secondary Schools were, however, generally poorly staffed and equipped when compared to the much favored Mission-sponsored and managed secondary schools (Halpern, 1965; Colclough and McCarthy, 1980).

The third period constituted the early 1970s to the period prior to 1984 (the year of the Partnership Policy). This period was similar in many ways to the 1930s and 1940s: Having lost their schools to government and at the same time realizing the growing demand for secondary education, communities once more evolved a new type of community schools. These schools mushroomed in Mahalapye, Mochudi, Moshupa and in all the country's towns. All were secondary, specifically intended to take students with lower grades (i.e., Cs and Ds) who by the nature of competition could not gain places in government and government-aided secondary schools (Personal interviews in Thamaga and with Hon. Mr. G. Mosinyi, MP, July 1987). These schools were, therefore, schools of the "underdog." They were second or even third quality schools, especially if one agrees with the common belief that government-aided schools were better than government schools.

The new community schools seriously lacked resources and were characterized by dilapidated buildings. They were staffed mainly by Zimbabwean and South African refugees most of whom had not been trained as teachers. They were poorly managed, with the occasional disappearance of school funds (Botswana Daily News, 1979). They were then also schools of the 'last resort' (NDP, 1973-78). It was believed that they were not the type of school to be encouraged if the ethics of equity and social justice were to live long in Botswana (National Education Commission, 1977).

The period after 1984 heralded a new era in Botswana's education system – an era of a universal nine-year basic education cycle to be delivered through the Community Junior Secondary/day schooling approach. That is, the schools would no longer be taken from the communities by government, but would be run in partnership. It is this latter period that the remaining sections will address and in doing so suggest what the departure from the past might mean for the future. Needless to say there are clear indications that despite the long history, communities still have fundamental problems in provision of resources and school management.

This short historical background has been important in dispelling what would appear a romanticized conception of past community participation in Botswana.

4.2 An Overview of Botswana's Educational Policy: 1966 - 1984

> "My Government has from the moment of its first taking office given top priority to educational expansion." (Sir Seretse Khama, 1968:229)

The above quotation serves to encapsulate the theme of the Botswana government's policies towards education since independence. In common with many governments and international organizations, the GOB committed itself not only to educational expansion at all levels but also to universal primary education in the 1980s. Indeed as a first step towards this goal, primary school fees were cut by half in the early 1970s and finally primary education was made free in 1980. At present, it is universal but not compulsory. Nevertheless, only 85% of that cohort attend primary school. A summary of expansion in primary education is provided by Table V. [The table is derived from a recent document produced by the Central Statistics Office (CSO) which used different fertility regimes to project expansions in enrollments, staffing and classrooms at primary school level between 1985 and 2015.]

Clearly, we can expect continual expansion at the primary level. A recent paper presented at the Botswana Educational Research Association (BERA) seminar, on the teaching of science at primary school level, argued that there is still much to be done to improve both the syllabus and methods of teaching at the primary school level (J. Morgan, 1987).

While pursuing an expansionist policy for all, government put emphasis on the expansion of secondary education during this period. Secondary education more than any other level was perceived as holding the key to economic development. It was claimed that without adequate personnel trained to a minimum of the Junior Certificate (the first three years of secondary education) development would be hampered as government could not afford to import expensive skilled personnel from abroad. This belief was as widespread then as it is today. Speaking in the late 1970s, the late President warned the nation that:

> "Unless we can encourage our sons and daughters to study and develop these skills which are essential to our development we may be forced to apply a brake on our expansion." (Sir Seretse Khama, 1977:332)

During the 1970s finance ceased to be the critical factor hampering development. Rather, it was a shortage of skilled personnel that delayed implementation of many development projects (NDP 1979-1985). As shown in the previous section, the public responded well to government appeals for the development of skilled personnel to run the economy. The secondary system expanded, schools were established all over the country, including some run purely by the communities. Indeed, by the mid-1970s public participation was so great that government was concerned about the possible dangers of an unmonitored expansion of the secondary system. As the NDP 1970-75 put it:

> "Although secondary school enrolments (had) doubled in the last three years the demand for places (had) far outstripped the number available. As a result many pupils unable to gain admission have turned to self-help night schools organized on a voluntary and private basis... There is a serious problem here, overexpansion using inadequate facilities and sub-standard teachers may lead to chaos, disillusion and bitterness among young people." (NDP, 1970, 1975:103)

The priority given education was confirmed by the appointment of what was probably not the first but was certainly the most widely announced Presidential Commission since independence. The 1976 National Education Commission (NEC) was certainly the most important landmark in the history of education in Botswana. The commission reported back in 1977, making far reaching recommendations addressing issues not only of manpower development but also those of equality of opportunities (equity), social justice and curricular relevance. Pertinent to the present study is that it unveiled the shortcomings of community management of schools while at the same time advocating for organized community participation (Education for Kagisano, 1977:96).

Moreover, the commission recommended and government accepted a number of reforms in the organizational structure of the Ministry and the education system as a whole. The changes in the organizational structure as well as in personnel of the Ministry of Education have undoubtedly been critical to policy innovations discussed in the next section. Overall, the commission's findings reinforced the expansionist policy and asked for more government commitment and investment on education (Education for Kagisano, 1977:97). The commission also went beyond the confines of the formal school system to address the areas of adult and nonformal education. Table V summaries the state of education in Botswana about nine years following the Commission's recommendations.

5.0 AN APPRAISAL OF BOTSWANA'S EDUCATIONAL DECENTRALIZATION POLICY

The preceding sections emphasized that from the beginning, government has encouraged non-governmental participation in educational development. Even before independence, some schools were built, financed and managed by the church and/or the community. Although the government has permitted this and prepared regulations governing private primary and secondary schools, it did not, until 1984, put forward a specific policy on the subject of educational decentralization. The Partnership Policy, announced in 1984, is therefore an important innovation that is destined to constitute a landmark in the history of education in Botswana.

This section summarizes the policy pronouncements and records public reactions thus far. The PP is an educational policy intended to draw the school closer to the community and the community closer to the school. It begins with the bold assertion that the secondary school, in particular, has been divorced from the community which it was supposed to serve (MOE, 1984:5). However, although projected simply in terms of facilitating provisions of education to most sections of the population, this policy has far reaching macroeconomic implications on other social issues such as unemployment, migration and lack of services in the rural areas. It is, to be precise, an important input into rural development in Botswana.

The PP, as espoused in the Ministry of Education's 1984 policy document, has three main components:

- the policy reiterates government's education objectives for the 1980s through to the year 2000,
- it explains advantages of community involvement, and
- it defines undertakings and obligations to be made by participants in the policy.

Summary of the National Education Objectives to the Year 2000

In line with previous education policies, government declares the following as education objectives for the next two decades:

- to provide a nine-year access to basic education for all by the mid-1990s;
- to ensure that schools are staffed only by qualified teachers, and thus to expand places for teacher education;
- to expand vocational education through increased enrollments at the polytechnic and Brigades, and the establishment of vocational training centers;
- to vigorously pursue the National Literacy Program and its follow-up in continuing basic education; and
- to ensure the efficient running of the education service as a whole, management will be decentralized as much as possible to District Education Centers (MOE, 1984:3).

Perhaps what is new in the present objectives is the emphasis put on both curriculum reform and community participation.

Reasons for Community Involvement

The policy gives the following as reasons for involving communities in the financing and management of intermediate schools in Botswana:

- to make the community feel responsible and committed to the efficient running of the school;
- to enrich the curriculum by incorporating local variations;
- to reduce the distance between home and the school, hence remove the need for boarding accommodation at the school;
- to allow the community access to school facilities for its other educational and non-educational activities; and
- to enable the community a share in the cost of providing secondary education in the country.

These reasons, though summarized, were taken in the order of priority that they appear in the policy document. (It is interesting to note that financial contributions by the community are mentioned last.)

Contributions by the Partners

Government as one of the partners under the policy, undertakes to provide the following for the Community Junior Secondary School:

- purpose – planning buildings including classrooms, library, teaching areas for science, home economics and other applied subjects, administration blocks and toilets;
- furniture and equipment for the above;
- a qualified head and teaching staff, paid from Ministry funds;
- up to 50% of houses required for the staff (except where Town Councils provide housing);
- a subsidy of P40 (P80 in 1987) for each pupil, to a maximum prescribed by the Ministry; and
- intermediate schools in very remote areas may also be provided with boarding hostels for pupils.

In its turn, the community is asked to undertake to provide:

- a board of governors to manage the school "in accordance with government regulations;"
- negotiate with the Land Board over the selection of the site and clear it ready for construction;
- appoint and sustain the ancillary staff of the school (bursar, secretary, domestic and other staff);
- maintain all school properties and equipment;
- construct a cooking area for the preparation of school lunches; and
- ensure that accommodation (rented or newly built) is available for the teaching staff.

In addition, communities can use their discretion to fence the property and prepare the School Sports areas.

A number of observations on the policy are in order at this stage. The first is that the concept of community is not defined. It is not at all clear what is meant by community. In practice, the community has been made synonymous with the "catchment area" or a group of villages served by the school. This has created problems; for example, school siting, i.e., in which ward or village in the catchment area to locate the school. This has created much debate, some of which has given rise to traditional neighborly conflicts which may in the long run jeopardize the good management of the school (Interviews in Kang, Hukuntsi, Lehututu, July 1987).

The second observation is that it is not clear whether religious institutions and private organizations, who, as we have seen, have been at the center of educational development in this country, are part of the community. If yes, should they be grouped together – while in the past their contribution was distinct and different? If no, and they are not regarded as part of the community, what is their role in this policy? Do they have any role to play, as they did in the past? Although the PP is silent on this matter, religious institutions continue to play an important role and are generally expected to continue to do so.

The private sector, however, has been left to play an indirect role, as they are free to assist either the school through the managing board of governors or by donation. In practice, the recent years following this policy have seen private agencies flooded with requests from the communities to finance or donate to their school. It is even claimed by some policy makers and teachers that most, if not all, that has been brought forward as community contribution has in fact come from donor agencies and the private sector (Interviews in Mochudi, Kanye and Hukuntsi, 1987). In one CJSS school the community contribution is reported to have been 30% when 70% was raised from private companies, shops and local churches (Personal interviews in Kgalagadi Villages, July 1987).

The third observation to be made about the PP is that it is inadequate insofar as there is no legislation to back it. To date, old regulations and legislation dating back to 1978, specifically intended for the self-help schools of the 1970s, have been applied. Recently headmasters have met to review this legislation. However, participants in a recent workshop argued that this legislation will never be adequate until:

- it involved not only headmasters and/or chairpersons of the boards of governors, but also all stakeholders, and
- certain aspects of the policy such as the role of district authorities, and the exact role of the stake holders in curriculum design and development have been clearly spelled out (SLEC workshop, August 1978).

The latter point brings us to the observation that the policy does not clarify what role(s) the community and other interested parties will play in the development of the curriculum and improvement of classroom teaching. As shown below both teachers and education officers are not ready to involve parents, at least not at this level.

Last, but not least, concerns about over regulation by government are still rife. Many people including education officers, teachers and members of the boards of governors feel that there are too many "dos and don'ts," even under the present policy. Many people feel that little community involvement can take place under the present regulations.

Finally, the implications of leaving the non-academic staff to be paid by the communities were terribly underestimated by this policy. This has raised fundamental problems of motivation among these workers. They feel that this is the type of job to be taken only as a desperate move. There are no benefits in terms of pension, gratuity, etc., and salaries are very low compared to other local government employees. Consequently, there has been a high turnover of semi-trained community paid staff at the CJSSs. Government has correctly recognized this and is attending to the problem (Interviews with the Department of Secondary Education, July 1987).

5.1 Public Reaction to the Partnership Policy

The remarks that follow are both cautiously and guardedly made, for several reasons. Firstly, because the policy is still not yet known to many people and communities. Secondly, because it is still in its early stages of implementation and coincides with other wider reforms in the system such as the change from 7-3-2 to 7-2-3 and finally to 6-3-3. Moreover, in the midst of this policy implementation, government has announced a decision to make secondary education free beginning January 1988. Thirdly, this is an experiment deserving popular support and too much criticism at this stage might result in the abandonment of an appropriate and important policy. And finally, in terms of this study (a study that is intended to determine the issues that effect the implementation of this policy) it is presumptuous to preempt any of the findings.

Notwithstanding the foregoing remarks, certain factions have already reacted to the policy. Teachers in particular are yet to be fully convinced of its appropriateness. They see their job as being to teach and produce good results. This to them is important in order to change or disassociate their school from the bad image of the past self-help schools. Consequently, they see, at the risk of being blunt, the shortage of teachers' accommodation as frustrating and refer to community participation as a waste of time. In addition, they say it is an invasion of their professional domain (Personal interviews in Thamaga and Mochudi, 1987). Interestingly, most of these are young inexperienced teachers keen to establish themselves in their new career by producing good results at the end of the year.

Community leaders and the community at large feel both ignorant, and in some cases deprived of information. They feel that the policy was not adequately explained to them and that they were unjustifiably committed (Personal interviews, 1987). Some feel bitter that the secondary schools that they had built for C and D grades have been absorbed and made part of the CJSS program without adequate consultation (Panel Discussion, Francistown, May 1987). In a few instances, planned schools were "nipped in the bud" by this policy.

Lastly, those at both the local and central government levels are not at all clear concerning the details of the policy and their particular roles in its implementation. They are therefore either indifferent or resistant to it (Interviews with Regional Education Officers, Kanye and Molepolole, 1987).

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report is based on a survey of literature on the subject of educational decentralization in general and in Botswana in particular. The literature offers lessons, both from this country's past and from the experiences of other countries. A main theme that emerges from the literature which perhaps strengthens the case for educational decentralization is that, unless it remains available only to a privileged few, education is socially a very costly investment to be left to the central government alone. Many governments who have, either out of benevolence or political expediency, tried to go it alone in funding education have after some time found themselves reintroducing school fees or some other unpopular education tax.

Partially drawing on the experiences of other nations, many developing countries, though for differing reasons, are resorting to various forms of decentralized administration. However, as pointed out in the text of this report, decentralization is a crucial step (but only one step) to sharing the cost, making curriculum more relevant and using the school to mobilize people for rural development. Moreover, decentralization, especially in terms of deconcentration, can easily become an instrument through which local and regional officers are put to task by their seniors at the center. Under these conditions, decentralization, as Bray (1985) showed, becomes an ideological tool of the state.

The literature reflected in this report also alluded to another potential danger of the process of decentralization. It was shown that untrained parents, boards of governors, etc., can easily bring confusion to the school, thus negatively affecting the quality of the education system. These fears, as we have shown, are currently rife in Botswana. Teachers and policy makers are reluctant to open school doors to the community for fear of loss of quality which in turn will give rise to poor results.

The policy review undertaken in this report pointed to a number of shortcomings to Botswana's Partnership Policy. Among these are the lack of clarity on the definition of community, hence leaving a gray area – what is the role of religious organizations and the private sector under the new policy? The review also showed that for it to be successful, an important policy such as this one requires both proper consultation with the people and clear legislation to back it. As it is, Botswana's PP was imposed, and is not well understood by the general public, including those involved in its implementation.

Overall, Botswana has made positive steps forward. At least at the central government level, the political and professional will is there to involve the wider population in school management and finance. What remains to be done is to work out details of how exactly to go about this. The next phase of this study is expected to provide guidelines and recommendations along these lines. Different opinions have been sought and offered on what issues need to be addressed and at what levels of policy making. Some of these have been incorporated into Phase II proposal and are presented below in the form of recommendations.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are the result of the literature review exercise, discussions with a number of individuals, meetings of the Advisory Committee, and the SLEC workshop. They are:

(a) To carry out a detailed survey on the communities' investment pattern, estimating the amount of resources available, both for general use and for educational development.

(b) Identify and assess other resources available from other sources; e.g., the school itself, the private sector, etc.

(c) Study and suggest methods of:

  (i) involving the community in curriculum design and development, and

  (ii) suggest forms of national examination that will take local variations into consideration.

(d) Investigate forms of legislation that will make the present policy workable while protecting both the community, student and government interests.

(e) Suggest methods of involving local authorities and creating relatively autonomous regional offices of education.

(f) Estimate manpower and financial requirements of regional offices.

(g) Suggest forums for future policy debates.

These recommendations are intended to help define such issues as types of communities and their resource endowment, potential contributions of other nongovernment stakeholders and the initiation of comprehensive legislation to guide management of CJSS in Botswana.

TABLE I

Share of Public Educational Expenditure in the Public Budget

REGION AND COUNTRY	YEAR	Total Educational Expenditure as % of Total Public Spending	Recurrent Educational Expenditure as % of Total Current Expenditure
EAST AFRICA			
Botswana	1983	18.5	23.4
Burundi	1981	15.6	20.8
Comoros	1982	36.0	40.6
Ethiopia	1982	11.3	14.2
Rwanda	1983	24.0	27.7
Swaziland	1981	14.1	23.0
WEST AFRICA			
Burkina Faso	1983	23.9	25.3
Cameroon	1983	17.2	21.7
Congo, RP of	1981	19.2	25.8
Cote D'Iveire	1979	29.8	39.8
Liberia	1980	24.3	27.0
EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC			
Singapore	1982	9.6	10.8
Solomon Islands	1979	10.6	15.6
SOUTH ASIA			
Bangladesh	1983	8.6	15.4
Burma	1977	12.2	14.6
Sri Lanka	1983	7.1	12.3
LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN			
Argentina	1982	14.5	18.2
Bahamas	1978	22.9	23.4
Barbados	1982	17.6	18.0
Colombia	1983	21.5	27.7
Ecuador	1980	33.3	36.0

Source: World Bank, *"Financing Education in Developing Countries 1986"*

Extracted from Appendix Table 2, pg. 46.

TABLE II

National Income, Public Expenditure and Population Growth 1965 -1980

	National Income			**Annual Growth Education Expenditure**			**School Age Population**		
REGION	65-70	70-75	75-80	65-70	70-75	75-80	65-70	70-75	75-80
East Africa	4.8	4.5	3.0	11.2	6.8	1.0	3.2	3.1	2.0
West Africa	5.1	3.0	4.3	7.2	8.5	6.6	2.9	3.4	3.1
East Africa & Pacific	8.6	7.2	7.8	7.5	4.3	9.6	3.3	2.2	1.4
South Asia	6.0	3.0	4.9	8.1	6.0	8.2	3.3	3.2	2.7
Latin America & Caribbean	5.2	4.6	4.5	6.8	4.2	6.1	3.1	2.7	1.9
Europe, Middle East & N. Africa	7.5	7.1	6.7	11.1	11.5	9.4	2.7	2.9	3.0
Developed Countries	5.0	3.4	2.9	7.8	6.8	3.5	0.7	2.3	0.1

Source: Extracted from W. B. Publication: *Financing Education in Developing Countries: An Exploration of Policy Options.*

TABLE III

National Income, Public Expenditure and Population Growth 1965 - 1980

REGION/COUNTRY	NATIONAL INCOME			ANNUAL GROWTH EDUCATION EXPENDITURE			SCHOOL AGE POPULATION		
	65-70	70-75	75-80	65-70	70-75	75-80	65-70	70-75	75-80
Developing countries									
EAST AFRICA	5.1	5.1	5.1	8.7	6.8	6.2	3.0	2.9	2.4
Ethiopia	4.8	4.5	3.0	11.2	6.8	1.0	3.2	3.1	2.9
Kenya	5.4	9.7	5.8	7.7	14.9	6.5	3.8	4.2	4.4
Malawi	4.9	8.1	4.2	10.1	-4.3	5.0	3.1	3.1	1.8
Rwanda	8.7	5.2	4.3	—	5.2	7.7	2.9	3.6	4.0
Somalia	4.0	3.3	4.1	—	18.7	1.9	3.7	2.3	2.0
Sudan	0.3	3.4	6.6	7.9	10.8	3.3	2.4	3.2	3.2
Tanzania	6.7	4.6	4.6	13.5	8.4	6.4	3.0	3.8	3.6
Uganda	5.5	0.0	-4.9	18.3	-8.5	-28.5	3.2	2.8	2.7
Zambia	2.7	2.5	-0.7	-2.2	10.0	-7.9	2.8	3.2	3.3
Zimbabwe	6.8	5.3	2.8	—	6.5	15.3	4.4	2.6	3.3
WEST AFRICA	5.1	3.0	4.3	7.2	8.5	6.6	2.9	3.4	3.1
Cameroon	4.8	4.0	8.0	6.7	6.8	4.6	2.7	3.1	3.1
Congo P.R	5.1	8.0	2.7	—	15.1	-0.8	2.7	2.8	4.0
Cote D'Ivoire	7.2	6.4	6.7	5.9	9.6	13.0	3.5	6.0	4.3
Ghana	2.7	0.0	0.5	3.7	6.5	-19.9	2.3	3.2	3.0
Liberia	9.1	1.6	4.7	13.0	0.8	27.0	3.4	3.6	1.9
Niger	-0.6	-2.2	7.9	8.3	11.2	10.6	3.2	3.6	3.4
Sierra Leone	5.2	2.3	1.5	3.3	3.6	4.4	2.0	2.3	2.1
Togo	7.2	4.0	2.0	9.2	14.1	14.4	3.7	2.6	2.6
EAST ASIA & PACIFIC	8.6	7.2	7.8	7.5	4.3	9.6	3.3	2.2	1.4
China	8.3	5.6	5.9	—	0.0	19.3	3.5	2.0	1.1
Hong Kong	7.9	6.9	12.7	—	8.4	12.7	3.7	1.3	0.7
Indonesia	7.1	7.2	7.5	—	8.7	-1.9	2.6	3.3	23.2
Korea Rep.	10.4	8.6	7.3	—	-1.6	21.0	3.2	1.9	0.9
Phillipines	4.8	6.5	6.2	4.0	0.0	2.6	3.1	3.0	3.1
Singapore	12.6	9.5	7.7	6.5	8.1	8.4	3.3	0.5	-0.8
Thailand	9.2	6.2	7.0	11.9	6.8	5.1	3.8	3.3	2.7
SOUTH ASIA	6.0	3.0	4.9	8.1	6.0	8.2	3.3	3.2	2.7
India	4.7	3.0	3.5	6.3	3.0	4.2	2.9	2.7	2.5
Pakistan	7.3	3.5	6.4	10.0	8.9	2.2	3.8	3.8	2.9
LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN	5.2	4.6	4.5	6.8	4.2	6.1	3.1	2.7	1.9
Argentina	4.2	3.0	1.7	7.5	-3.7	10.0	1.5	1.3	1.0
Bolivia	3.8	6.0	2.6	8.9	6.6	3.8	2.4	2.8	3.0

TABLE IV

A Typology of the Organization of School Systems

	PRIVATE SECTOR		PUBLIC SECTOR		
FEATURE	PURE PRIVATE MODEL	MIXED MODEL	PURE DECENTRAL. MODEL	MIXED MODEL	PURE CENTRAL. MODEL
Finance					
(a) Revenue contributions	Private contributions (tution & fees)	Private contributions plus Govt. grants	Local Govt. own revenues	Local Govt. own revenues plus grants from higher levels of Govt.	Full Central Govt. funding
(b) Method of financing	All sch. inputs financed by sch. revenues	Some sch. inputs financed by grants, contrib'n from Govt.	Sch. inputs financed by Local Govt.	Some sch. inputs provided by higher levels of Govt.	All sch. inputs provided directly in kind to schs.
Management					
(a) Dec/mkg on spending	Dec/mkg set by sch.	Dec/mkg of sch. subject to Govt. control	Local Govt. autonomy	Local Govt. decisions constrained by higher levels of Govt.	Decis'ns set by Central Govt.
(b) Fee Policy	Fees reflect market forces	Fee ceiling imposed by Govt.	Local Govt. autonomy in setting fees	Fees subject to control of higher levels of Govt.	No fees are levied
(c) Service Provision	Free choice in curricula	Some constraint in curricula	Local choice in curricula	Local choice limited by higher levels of Govt.	Standard curricula for all schools

SOURCE: Adapted from Winkler (1986)

TABLE V

General Education Data (1986)

Total Population (1986)	1,079,000
Enrollment level:	
Literacy program	40,649
Primary education	223,608
Secondary education	39,584
Teacher Training	1,653
Vocational/Technical	670
Correspondence courses	2,131
Brigades	1,006
University of Botswana	1,543
Completion rates in formal education:	
Primary standard 4	93 %
standard 7	89 %
Transition to intermediate (JC)	40 %
Transition to secondary	41 %
Pupil:Teacher ratio:	
Primary	32:1
Secondary	24:1
Recurrent expenditure	P 82,482,310
Percentage of national recurrent expenditure	17.7 %
Development expenditure	P 33,000,000
Percentage of national development expenditure	12.1 %

Source: MOE, 1986.

Selected Bibliography

BENSON, M. Tshekedi Khama. (London, Faber and Faber, 1960).

BHAGWATI, J. "Educational Class Structure and Income Distribution." World Development, No. 5, 1973.

BRAY, M. "Education and Decentralization in Less Developed Countries: A Comment on General Trends, Issues and Problems with Particular Reference to Papua, New Guinea." Comparative Education, Vol. 21, no. 2, 1985.

BOTSWANA NATIONAL ARCHIVES (BNA). Files No. S373/4/6/8/9.

DOOB, L. Acquiring Modern Abilities "From Tribalism to Nationalism in Africa," J.W. Hanson et al. (eds.), Education and the Development of Nations. (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, N. Y., Chicago, et al., 1966).

HALPERN, J. South Africa's Hostages: Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland. (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1965).

HANSON, E. Educational Reform and Administrative Development: The Cases of Colombia and Venezuela. (Hoover Institution Press, University of Stanford, Stanford California, 1986).

HARBISON, F. Human Resources as the Wealth of Nations. (N. Y., Oxford University Press, 1973).

JIMENEZ, E. & JEE PENG TANG. "Decentralized and Private Education: The Case of Pakistan." A World Bank Discussion Paper in The Education and Training Series, 1987.

KHAMA, S. From The Frontline: Speeches of Sir Seretse Khama, edited by G.M. Carter & E.P. Morgan. (London, Rex Collings, 1980).

MUNGER, E. Bechuanaland: Pan African Outport or Bantu Homeland? (London Institute of Race Relations and Oxford University Press, 1965).

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS I, II, III, IV, V and VI (1966 - 91). MFDP, Government of Botswana, Gaborone.

OECD. Policies For Higher Education in the 1980s. (OECD, Paris, 1981).

PSACHARAPOLOUS, G. "The Perverse Effects of Public Subsidization of Education or How Equal is Free Education." Comperative Education Review, Vol. 21:1 1977.

RONDINELLI, D. & NELLIS, J. "Assessing Decentralization Policies in Developing Countries: The Case for Cautious Optimism," Development Policy Review (SAGE, London, Beverly Hills and Delhi, 1986). The World Bank, Decentralization in Developing Countries: A Review of Recent Experience: World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 581, 1984.

SANBROOK, R. The Politics of Basic Needs: Urban Aspects of Assaulting Poetry in Africa. (London, Heineman Educational Books, 1982).

SCHAPERA, I. Native Land Tenure in The Bechunaland Protectorate. (Alice, The Lovedale Press, 1943).

SEERS, D. The Meaning of Development: Eleventh World Conference of the Society for International Development. (New Delhi, 1969).

Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems Project

POLICY RESEARCH INITIATIVE

STRENGTHENING LOCAL EDUCATION CAPACITY

BOTSWANA

PHASE II RESEARCH REPORT

Dr. Patrick P. Molutsi
University of Botswana

November 1989

Table of Contents

Page

1.0 Introduction . . . . A 2–5

2.0 Background Information . . . . A 2–7

3.0 Investment in Education . . . . A 2–11

4.0 Methodology . . . . A 2–13

5.0 Findings . . . . A 2–15

6.0 Interpretation and Analysis of Findings . . . . A 2–25

7.0 Conclusions and Recommendations . . . . A 2–31

Attachment: Interview Schedule . . . . A 2–33

List of Tables

1. The Growth of Enrollments in the Education and Training System, 1965-75 . . . . A 2–8
2. Expansion in Enrollment, Schools & Teachers, 1965-75, 1975-87 . . . . A 2–9
3. (Not in original document) . . . . —
4. Projected Requirements for Primary Educational Facilities and Finance, 1985-2015 . A 2–11
5. Major Characteristics of the Sampled Areas . . . . A 2–14
6. Ethnic Composition of the Sample . . . . A 2–15
7. Ethnic Composition of the Sample by District . . . . A 2–16
8. Parents Level of Education . . . . A 2–17
9. Percentage Distribution of the Sample by Education . . . . A 2–17
10. Highest Level of Education of Heads of Households (Percentages) . . . . A 2–18
11. Age Distribution of the Sample . . . . A 2–18
12. Occupations of the Sample . . . . A 2–19
13. Sources of Requests to Help CJSSs . . . . A 2–23
14. Number of Children at CJSS . . . . A 2–24
15. Gini Coefficient by Location . . . . A 2–27
16. Sources of Revenue for Selected District Councils . . . . A 2–28
17. School Boards of Governors by Levels of Education . . . . A 2–30

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The search for educational resources is a pressing one. Rapidly growing populations and falling economic growth rates particularly in developing countries have increased the need to identify strategies which will result in the provision of a sustainable resource base for educational development. Recent trends in developing and developed countries alike show a pattern of reduced expenditures on education. Indications are that these reductions in educational budgets when coupled with rapid expansions in enrollments have resulted in a detrimental impact that has effected both the quality and equity in schools.

Traditionally, parents, communities, religious organizations and the private sector have contributed to education. They have built schools, and supported and managed them over the years. Indeed in many colonies, education was for many decades, largely community financed. Of course, community and private organizations efforts in this endeavor have not been without problems. In many cases there were problems of quality and limited access necessitated by a lack of resources, poor facilities, poor management, and a shortage of qualified teachers and administrators (see Commonwealth Papers on Community Finance, Gaborone, 1985; B.C Thema, 1947; J. Halpern, 1965 in the case of Bechuanaland Protectorate).

In the forty years following the end of the Second World War, under relatively prosperous economic conditions, many governments, including those reliant on foreign aid, made substantial increases in their education budgets. In some cases central government financing of education almost eliminated the need for community support. For most developing countries emerging from the degraded and underdeveloped conditions of colonialism, the role of central government in educational development was a necessity not a matter of choice. The dire need to train, develop and educate indigenous people to occupy decision making positions in the new administrations was an urgency felt by many new states.

However, currently, some forty years later, governments are facing a dilemma caused by their earlier actions. Demand for education and modern sector employment is enormous. Central government revenues are shrinking, and as a consequence governments are looking back to the communities, religious organizations and the private sector to assist in funding education. However, to involve communities in a sustained way has not been an easy job. A carefully crafted program is required, supported by legislation that clearly defines the role and responsibility of each participant in the funding process.

Some governments have found that while they need external resources, it is not administratively, professionally, or political viable to involve communities and the private sector extensively in the management of schools (Bray, 1985). These and related concerns have to some extent retarded progress in the search for funds for education in some countries. Others have found that communities are in fact important assets which can be used to improve the efficiency of the education system, reducing government costs without causing a decline in quality.

Botswana has since the early 1970s enjoyed unusually prosperous economic conditions. GOB revenues more than trebled between 1970 and 1985. From this strong financial position, and given the gross underdevelopment of the country's human resources during the colonial period, the central government has invested heavily in education. In the process GOB involvement lessened the need for community and other nongovernmental sectors to finance education. Over the long-term, however, it is evident that, even in prosperous Botswana, government resources will not be able to fund the rising costs of education. Beginning in the early 1990s, GOB revenue will begin to decline (National Development Plan, 1985-91).

Recognizing both the long-term need for diversification of educational resources and the value of democratizing and decentralizing the rapidly expanding education system, GOB in 1984 introduced a policy concerning the decentralization of education, the Partnership Policy. The policy specifically addresses the finance and management of the newly introduced Community Junior Secondary Schools (CJSS). It defines the roles of GOB, the communities and any other organizations interested in education. In contrast to the then current practice, the policy introduced new attitudes, roles, perceptions and structures into these new schools.

In March 1987, in light of the far reaching implications of this policy on the school system, the Ministry of Education in collaboration with USAID commissioned a two-year study on the viability of this policy. The study was to assess the community resource base, identify methods of community participation, and to assess the flow of information between the Ministry of Education and the schools, government and communities, and the school and community. Above all, the study was to address the issue of manpower requirements for the Ministry under the new policy and in light of the expanding education system.

This report is the second product of that study. The first report, based largely on a review of literature on community participation, was presented in a workshop in August 1987 and later published by the Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems (IEES) Project in May 1988. Although that report focused on Botswana, comparative literature from other African, and developing and developed countries was reviewed to establish both the major issues and the trends in community and private sector involvement in education. Limited interviews with headmasters, teachers, members of school boards of governors as well as key officers at the Ministry of Education were conducted during the preparation of that report. The study's first report contained:

1. A Status Report – a summary of the literature on community participation. Also included were a preliminary analysis of Botswana's Partnership Policy.
2. An annotated bibliography – a comprehensive listing of the sources available on community participation.
3. The Proposal for the second phase of the study.

This second phase report second phase draws on the interviews and data collected between August and December 1988. The methodology employed is presented in section three and the findings in section

80

four, while section five presents the implications of the findings and section six the conclusion and recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The literature review showed that Botswana, like other former colonies, for a long time relied on communities and missions to provide schools and schooling (B.C. Thema, 1947; E.S. Munger, 1965). During the colonial period, the chief or a community leader was an important source of inspiration and mobilization in educational development (M. Benson, 1960 on the role of Tshekedi Khama). However, the community and mission groups who constructed and financed schools experienced enormous problems throughout the colonial period. Among these problems were a shortage of qualified teachers, poor facilities, poor management and an absence of local resources for educational development.

The thirst for education nevertheless propelled many communities to continue to invest their limited resources on education. In retrospect, and in economic terms, community efforts at that time may appear wasteful. The high failure and dropout rates experienced raise serious questions about the school system as it was then. Indeed, in spite of increased investments in education since 1938, at the time of independence, Botswana was among the least literate societies in the world (Halpern, 1965; Munger, 1965). The lack of qualified indigenous personnel at independence closely defined the country's post-colonial education policy. GOB policy became one of rapid expansion in order to prepare qualified locals to replace expatriate labor (Colclough & McCarthy, 1980).

Under this policy, issues of equity, popular participation and relevance of curriculum were not of high priority. The results of immediate post-independence policy are vividly shown in Table 1.

As Table 1 indicates, the primary enrollment increased from 66,061 to 116,293 with an annual growth rate of 5.8% over the decade. This represents an increase in the proportion of primary enrollment in age group from 47.2% to 62.9%. The developments in the secondary and postprimary training enrollments are even more striking and clearly reflect the thrust of educational policy in the decade. Here total enrollment increased from 1,683 to 12,148 with a growth rate of 21.9% per annum over the period; the ratio of total enrollment to total population of that age group rose from 3:1 to 18:1.

Secondary school enrollment grew by almost 25% per annum if we include part-time students in private secondary institutions (see Table 2). The corresponding figure for teacher training was 6% per annum. Higher education and postsecondary training enrollment grew by 20.5% p.a. despite the small real change in the age group enrollment from 0.2% to 1%.

Table 1

The Growth of Enrollments in the Education and Training System 1965-75

	1965	1975
Primary Education		
Pop-aged 5-14	140,000	185,000
Primary Enrollment	66,061	116,293
% of age group	47.2	62.9
Secondary & Postprimary Education		
Pop-aged 15-19	54,000	67,000
Secondary Enrollments	1,307	9,917
Teacher Training	276	489
Technical Training	50	1,276
Agricultural Training	–	139
Nursing Training	50	327
Total Enrolled	1,683	12,148
% of Age Group	3.1	18.1
Higher Education & Postsecondary Training		
Pop-aged 20-24	46,000	55,000
Total Enrolled	83	543
% of Age Group	0.2	1.0

Source: Colclough, et al., 1980, p. 213.

Number of Teachers & Schools

Other indicators of change in the school system are the number of teachers and schools. As Table 2 shows, in the same ten-year period the number of primary school teachers increased from 1,657 to 3,509 while the number of primary schools rose from 247 to 323 (government schools only) – annual growth, 7.8 and 2.7, respectively.

The expansion in the number of primary schools was slow owing to both the extent of capital and recurrent expenditures involved. With regard to growth in secondary schools and teachers, the expansion is again a reflection of the priority accorded that sector during that period. The number of schools increased from 9 to 29 while the number of teachers rose from 66 to 570 – annual growth rates, 12.4% and 24.1%, respectively.

The use of changes in enrollment, number of teachers and schools to portray the expansion in the school system, particularly during the period before 1975, needs to be qualified in three respects.

1. The rapid expansion especially in primary enrollment led to overcrowding. Colclough, et al., note that in 1965 the pupil:teacher ratio was 40:1 and that out of a total of 1,341 primary classes, 231 comprised of 80 pupils or more. Overcrowding would have been a more serious problem but for the high wastage rates that resulted in only 40% completing the primary cycle.

Table 2

Expansion in Enrollment, Schools & Teachers 1965-75, 1975-87

	1965	1975	P.A. Growth %	1975	1987	P.A. Growth %
Primary Schools						
Enlmnt.	66,061	116,293	5.8	116,293	248,823	6.5
Tchrs.	1,651	3,509	7.8	3,509	7,704	6.8
Schs.	247	323	2.7	323	55	4.6
Secondary Schools						
Enlmnt.	1,307	12,098	24.9	12,098	38,200	10.0
Tchrs.	66	570	24.9	570	1,619	10.0
Schs.	9	29	12.4	29	80	8.8
Teacher Training						
Enrlmnt.	271	489	6.0	489	68	3.5
University						
F/T students	44	465	26.6	46	2255	14.1

Source: C. Colclough, et al., 1980.

2. Secondly, the use of the growth rate of the number of schools is misleading since, during the period under consideration, many schools were single room buildings which accommodated up to 6 classes. (There were also instances of classes being conducted outdoors.)
3. Colclough and McCarthy also made reference to "qualitative deficiency in the teaching profession." For example,

> "Almost 50% of the primary school teachers were untrained prior to independence and of those who had attended one of the two training colleges at Lobatse or Serowe, most did not themselves possess more than an indifferent primary education." (C. Colclough, et al., 1980, p. 207)

All these are factors which affected the quality of education in the colonial and immediate post-independence period. These qualifications not withstanding, the overall impression provided by the data should not be overlooked.

Botswana's education system has changed significantly since 1975. Rapid expansion in enrollments has continued but GOB policies have shifted to issues of equity, community participation and curriculum relevance. The source of this shift was the Education Commission of 1976. Criticisms at that time were:

- The school curriculum was irrelevant to the realities of Botswana since it was elitist.
- The education system promoted inequality as the distinction between rural and urban schools in terms of both facilities and staff was wide.

- The school system was wasteful, at the time less than 25% of the children graduating from primary schools were able to secure places in junior secondary schools and that an even smaller proportion was able to proceed beyond junior secondary.
- The quality of teachers was deteriorating as schools expanded and classes enlarged while only a few teachers were being trained.

This was the background against which the famous *Education for Kagisanyo – Education for National Unity* document (the current GOB blueprint for education) was produced in 1977 by the Presidential Commission on Education.

Briefly, the recommendations of the Commission were as follows:

- Abolition of primary school fees and the introduction of universal primary education by 1980.
- Introduction of a crash program of teacher training for primary and secondary school teachers. The University and the Teacher Training Colleges were to mount crash programs in the area of teacher education.
- GOB should gradually increase the subsidy to the most impoverished private/community secondary schools.
- Drastic curriculum reform was required as was the introduction of technical subjects.
- A careful program of decentralization of school management once access had been improved, equity assured, and a comparability in school facilities attained.

Many of the Commission's recommendations were accepted by GOB and have since been implemented. For example, schooling is currently being restructured from a 7-3-2 to 6-3-3 division. The fees, teachers' salaries and other educational expenditures have increasingly become the responsibility of central government. At the same time the expansionist momentum has been maintained, though on a principle of equity, rather than manpower needs.

Table 2 illustrates the quantitative changes that have taken place since 1975. The picture that emerges is, in the primary school system, enrollment and number of teachers more than doubled in absolute terms between 1975 and 1987 while the number of schools increased by 72%. In terms of annual growth rates, the growth momentum in all three areas generated in the previous decade has been maintained with only a slight decrease in the growth of the number of teachers from 7.8% to 6.8%.

In the secondary system, despite gains in absolute terms, the annual growth in enrollment and number of teachers has decreased by more than 50% when compared to the decade after independence, while that of schools declined by about 30%. However, it is quite obvious that the emphasis on secondary and postsecondary education evident in the decade of 1965-75 has been maintained.

The quality of the school system also appears to have improved. Writing in the mid-1980s Hartwell noted that:

> "While the rates of dropout for the government supported schools fluctuate between 4% and 16% over this period (1983-87), there is a radical improvement between 1983 & 1987 for the community supported schools, from 41% to 7% dropout (bearing in mind

that the 1987 figure represents only two years of junior secondary schooling)." (Hartwell, 1988:10)

A combination of better qualified teachers, improved facilities and better management have largely been responsible for the improvement in the quality of junior secondary education in particular.

The next chapter shows that while GOB has over the past decade-and-a-half shouldered most of the cost of education, it cannot afford to do so in the future due to declined revenues.

3.0 INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION

Since the central government assumed responsibility for education, government expenditure in the sector increased from about 10% of the recurrent Budget in the late 1960s to about 20% in 1975 (Colclough, et al., 1980). Between 1976 and 1988 recurrent expenditure on education as a percentage of total recurrent expenditure has fluctuated between 19.7% and 23.6%.

The ratio of Botswana's total expenditure on education to total government spending compares favorably with others in Africa. For example, the ratio for Burundi (1981), Ethiopia (1982), Rwanda (1983) and Swaziland (1981) were 15:6, 11:3, 24:0 and 14:1 respectively (World Bank, 1986:46). The ratio of recurrent expenditure on education to government recurrent expenditure for the same countries and same years were 20:8, 14:2, 27:7 and 23:0. It is clear that Botswana, like a number of countries in Africa was devoting a significant proportion of government spending to education.

In terms of annual rate of growth of total educational expenditure Botswana virtually surpassed all African countries during the early seventies. For example, the highest annual growth rate recorded in the World Bank sample was 18.7% for Somalia between 1970-75: The corresponding figure for Botswana between 1970-76 was 30.3%. For the 1975-80 period, the highest growth rate was recorded for Liberia (27.0%) compared to Botswana 22.7% (1976-82).

Botswana's projected requirements for educational facilities and finance up to the year 2015 indicate that it is going to be impossible for the government to bear the cost of education in the future.

Table 4

Projected Requirements for Primary Educational Facilities and Finance, 1985 - 2015

	1985	2000	2015
Pri. Sch. Enrlmnt.(1)	213,000	385,000	695,000
Pri. Sch. Teachers(2)	6,700	12,000	21,700
No. of Pri. Classrooms	4,400	8,000	14,500
Pri. Recurrent Exp.(3) (Pula, millions)	26.2	47.0	85.5

Notes:

1. Projection based on the assumption that fertility will remain at the current level; slightly under 7 births per female.

2. Untrained teachers not included.
3. Based on the 1985 per-pupil cost of P123; reported in 1985 constant Pula.

Source: Population Factors & Development, CSO, MFDP, 1987.

Table 4 shows that between 1985 and 2015, primary school enrollment, needed primary school teachers, and primary school classrooms, as well as the required recurrent budget for primary education will all expand at the rate of 4.0% per annum. In 1985, the recurrent budget for primary education was 29.5% of total educational recurrent budget. The projected recurrent educational budget for 2000 and 2015, based on this ratio, will be P.160.3.3 million and P.289.8.8 million, respectively.

GDP per capita in 1985 was estimated at P.1,524 and projected to grow at the rate of 4.8% per annum over the current plan period; this growth is projected to decline to 3.0% p.a. through the year 2000. With population growing at the present rate of 3.4% p.a. it is estimated that per capita GDP will decline to P.1,170 by 2015; i.e., a decline at the rate of 0.08% p.a. (CSO, MFDP, 1987). Such long-term projections are, of course, fraught with uncertainty; nonetheless a closer look at the factors that have been responsible for the impressive growth of the past two decades indicates that these projections are well within the realm of probability.

According to the Midterm Review of the current Plan undertaken in May 1988:

> "Real GDP growth of less 5% p.a. will not raise per capita income very quickly in a country where the population growth rate is around 3.4% per annum. Unless private sector growth accelerates by the mid-1990s, the situation will get even worse with stagnation in per capita income a real possibility as the rate of growth of the government sector slows down in response to slow growth in revenues and foreign exchange reserves." (Midterm Review at NDP 6, MFDP, May 1988)

In addition the Review observes:

> "...the third largest sector in the economy, Government, is projected to be the fastest growing component of GDP, at almost 8% p.a. but this rapid a pace of expansion of the government sector is not feasible beyond the early 1990s." (Midterm Review, 1988:27-28)

After the early 1990s the public sector is expected to cease to be the engine of growth of the economy. In the light of a declining growth in both per capita income and the public sector, it is difficult to see how the 4% growth in recurrent education is necessary to maintain the current level of expenditure to be sustained between 1985 and 2015.

Given the difficulties GOB faces in the funding of education, it is clear that there is a need to expand the number of sources of monies for education to incorporate other stakeholders.

At present some subsectors of education are currently disproportionately subsidized by government, in particular the secondary and tertiary levels. Given the gloomy economic projections that face many LDCs, including Botswana, it may be necessary for governments to dismantle subsidies, and to begin to institute cost recovery measures.

For Botswana, the long-term economic projections suggest that government in the future cannot afford to completely subsidize all levels of education. Moreover, in the context of a rapidly growing population, the demand for education and related facilities will increase while the sectorial competition for declining government revenue intensifies. The arguments that manpower planners and proponents of localization used in the past to justify high government investment in education no longer hold, as there is growing unemployment, inequality across regions, and persistent poverty especially in the rural sector (Labor Survey, 1985, Household Incomes and Expenditure Survey, CSO, 1989). It is therefore critical that GOB look toward sharing the responsibility for funding education before such times as a shortage of resources causes a decline in educational quality and serious impacts on the access currently afforded much of the population.

4.0 METHODOLOGY

This report is the outcome of field work conducted in 1988 by a research team comprised of two principal researchers, seven graduate student assistants from the Faculty of Social Science, UB, and a secretary. Dr. Jeremy Strudwick of the Institute for International Research provided technical assistance.

Sampling

In light of the vastness of Botswana and the geographic and cultural variations that exist, the team adopted a purposive random sample as a method of selecting the enumeration sites for the study's survey. Among the considerations made were:

- Regional location: rural or urban.
- Ethnic composition: ethnically homogeneous or heterogeneous.
- Population size: large, medium or small size village/town, in terms of the 1981 census figures.
- Isolation: distance from the rail-line.
- Schooling present: existence and age of the local CJSS.
- History of community participation in education.

Using this, and other criteria, the sampling frame shown in Table 5 was selected.

87

Table 5
Major Characteristics of the Sampled Areas

Name	Description	Pop.	Location	No.of CJSSs
Gaborone	National Capital	87,346	Eastern	5
Serowe	Headquarters Central Dist.	31,010	Central	4
Molepolole	Headquarters Kweneng Dist.	25,000	Western	2
Kanye	Headquarters Southern Dist.	24,570	Southern	3
Francistown	Oldest Town	37,759	Northern	2
Good Hope	Small Village	1,841	Southern	1
Sikwane	Small Village	1,090	Eastern	1
Gumare	Remote Village	1,794	N-Western	1
Kang	Remote Village	1,684	Kalahari	1

Due to transportation problems, limited resources, and time constraints it was not possible to visit Kang and Gumare. The two locations were replaced in the sample by Letlhakeng (a medium size village in the Kgalagadi District) and the Herero ward in Mahalapye (a village with the some basic population characteristics as Gumare).

Households to be surveyed were selected employing a systematic sampling technique (i.e., the first house was selected randomly followed by the selection of every *nth* house until the desired sample was obtained). Although this sampling method was used throughout the survey, the *n* interval between houses differed from one area to the next. This factor changed for two reasons: up-to-date sampling frames for every site were not available, and we were dealing with villages and towns that had very different population sizes and geographical distribution of homes.

Data Collection – Instruments and Interviews

The main method of data collection was the interview. An instrument was prepared, field tested, and appropriately modified, and then administered to a total sample of 1,450. The sample was not altered from its natural composition; i.e., with parents, teachers, school administrators, community leaders, extension workers, ordinary citizens and resident foreigners. There was no requirement of having a child at school, all were eligible for interview if they were either the head of the household or their representative.

A modified interview schedule was later administered separately to policy makers in the Ministries of Education, Finance and Development Planning, and Local Government and Lands. In total, twenty such officers were interviewed. The responses of a number of these officers, as well as those collected in the earlier phase of the study from teachers, school administrators and community leaders have been taken into account in the analysis and interpretation that follows.

Realizing the shortcomings of the interview technique and the frequency with which similar interviews have recently been administered to schools, emphasis was also put on direct observation and the documentation of qualitative data that might help the interpretation of the interview results. Assistants were asked to prepare summaries of their experiences in the field, and those reports together with the principal researcher's own observations have been helped to shape the interpretation and conclusions in this report.

The researchers also talked with community leaders and politicians and attended community kgotla meetings. These interviews acted as cross-checks for some of the observations made during the study's primary interviews.

Although, as far as was possible, our sample was nationally representative, we can only cautiously and broadly generalize the study's findings. However, our conclusions are strengthened by the findings of other studies of related subjects and concerns conducted in different parts of Botswana.

5.0 FINDINGS

Communities behave differently for a number of reasons; size, location, ethnic composition, resources, status, educational level of the population, religious beliefs, sex ratio, and a myriad of other cultural, political and demographic variables. It was an objective of this study, to capture readings on as many of these variables as was possible.

Ethnicity

The selection of enumeration area took into consideration the ethnic and cultural composition of Botswana. It has been noted in this country, and elsewhere, that certain ethnic groups tend to readily accept formal education while others do not. In Botswana for instance, the Hereros, especially those in the North Western parts, being true pastoralists, tend to put cattle tendering skills before the formal education of a child. Similarly, the BaZezuru group is said to prefer blacksmithing to education in its formal sense. Noting ethnicity as a potential influencing independent variable that may explain differences in community participation in school development, the study took note of the respondents ethnicity (see Table 6).

Table 6

Ethnic Composition of the Sample

Ethnic Group	Frequency	Percentage of Total Sample
Tswana	1,138	78.9
Herero	29	2.0
Kalanga	148	10.3
Other Africa	81	5.6
Asian	9	0.6
Other Nationalities	38	2.6
Total	**1,443**	**100.0**

89

National statistics do not report the ethnicity of the population. Therefore it is a simple matter to determine the degree of under- or over-representation reflected in the sample. The important point to note, however, is that some respondents insisted on being identified as Batswana and nothing else. For instance, while 38 people were interviewed from the Herero ward in Mahalapye only 29 of them regarded themselves as Herero, and 9 said they were Tswana. While it is possible that they were in fact Tswana living among the Herero, there was a marked tendency among some respondents there to distort their ethnic origin. The geographical and ethnic origins of the respondents is shown in Table 7.

Table 7
Ethnic Composition of the Sample by District

Village/				Other		Other	
Town	**Tswana**	**Herero**	**Kalanga**	**African**	**Asian**	**Nat'l**	**T'tlt**
Gaborone	413	2	24	25	4	30	498
Francistown	113	3	114	19	3	4	256
Serowe	173	–	9	–	–	–	18
Molepolole	197	–	–	4	–	1	202
Kanye	190	–	–	2	1	2	195
Good Hope	28	–	1	–	1	1	31
Mahalapye	14	24	–	–	–	–	38
Letlhakeng	1	–	–	31	–	–	32
Sikwane	9	–	–	–	–	–	9
Total	**1,138**	**29**	**148**	**81**	**9**	**37**	**1,443**

The ethnic and geographical distribution of the respondents should have captured any variation on the basis of these two variables. Indeed, our results and general observations suggest that smaller villages tended to be more informed and organized to participate in school activities than is the case in large and urban centers. More people in villages such as Good Hope and Sikwane said they helped the school, while Gaborone residents stressed ignorance of many issues, and reported that they had not been approached to help the CJSS in their area.

Education

The educational level of a population is normally regarded as an important explanatory variable concerning behavior. Educated parents are generally expected to give more value to education and show more interest in both their childrens' education and the proper running of their school. On the other hand, realizing the gap in the standard of living between them, the less and more educated families, the uneducated, illiterate parents may be more committed to sending their children to school in order to improve their life chances. We found that the latter group of parents does not usually take an active role in school activities, although they may from time to time contribute money and/or labor to school development projects.

Even more importantly the strong link that exists between one's educational qualification, occupation, and income suggests that educated parents may have higher incomes and be more able to pay educational costs to some degree. This study hypothesized that parents' education level would be a determining influence on parents availability to assist at school, to contribute to, and to participate in, school activities at the individual and community levels. That is to say, educated households will be more receptive to, and be more willing to participate in activities that stem from the GOB's Partnership Policy. The same should also be true of a community of more educated households. It was to test this hypothesis that parents' educational levels were reported (see Tables 8 and 9).

Table 8
Parents Level of Education

Village/ Town	Univ/ Poly	T.T. Coll.	Snr. Sec.	Jnr. Sec.	Pri.	Pri/Not Comp.	NFE/Lit. Classes	No Edu.
Gaborone	43	48	44	94	125	67	6	72
Francistown	5	9	8	43	78	65	4	40
Serowe	-	4	1	16	63	52	-	46
Molepolole	1	8	4	19	45	58	8	58
Kanye	2	2	5	17	35	64	5	65
Good Hope	1	4	-	7	3	6	1	9
Mahalapye	-	1	1	3	5	10	1	17
Letlhakeng	-	-	-	-	11	8	5	8
Sikwane	-	-	-	-	2	6	-	1
Total	52	76	63	199	367	336	31	316

Table 9
Percentage Distribution of the Sample by Education

Level	Frequency	Percentage of Total Sample
Univ/Poly	52	3.6
T.T. College	76	5.3
Snr. Secondary	63	4.4
Jnr. Secondary	199	13.8
Primary	367	25.5
Primary not compl.	336	23.3
Nonformal education/ Literacy classes	31	2.2
No education	316	21.9
Total	**1,440**	**100.0**

Table 9 shows that the large majority (72.9) of the parents sampled had a primary education or lower, with 65% of those not having completed primary school. The number of those without any form of education was lower than normally would be expected. There are two possible reasons for this: First, the urban population was overrepresented in the sample, towns have higher literacy rates than the rural areas (Pop. Census, 1981). And, secondly, even in the more rural areas the sample was focused in the villages where schools are concentrated. However, overall the educational levels of the respondents approximated that observed in other studies (see below).

Table 10

Highest Level of Education of Heads of Households (Percentages)

Region	Number	None	Pri.	Sec.	Higher	Total
All Urban	58,900	20.2	52.4	21.7	5.7	100.0
Rural	163,493	57.8	35.2	6.3	0.7	100.0
National	222,393	47.8	39.7	10.4	2.1	100.0

Source: Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES), 1989, CSO, Gaborone.

HIES did not distinguish further within categories of education. Even so, the data reported by the two studies are comparable, particularly considering that the SLEC data is biased toward those areas where CJSSs are located. However, although most probably influencing earned incomes, education did not appear to be a significant factor determining participation or support of CJSSs. Comparatively well-educated communities displayed levels of participation and contribution. On the other hand, education was considered important in the selection of candidates for membership to the schools' Boards of Governors. The study's researchers found that a number of relatively educated people were either bitterly opposed to the composition of the school boards, or they refused to contribute to the school because the board was chaired by what they termed "illiterates."

Age and Gender

Respondents, primarily heads of households or guardians, were also asked to provide age and sex information.

Table 11

Age Distribution of the Sample

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage of Total Sample
20 and Below	56	4.1
21 - 30	476	34.7
31 - 40	380	27.7
41 - 50	212	15.4
51 - 60	148	10.8
61 - 70	94	6.8
Over 70	7	.5
Total	1,373	100.0

Over 38% of the respondents were less than 30 years of age. This may sound anomalous since most of these could not possibly have children old enough to be in secondary schools. However, in Botswana as in other developing countries, the extended family plays an important role in family welfare. A number of households have as their breadwinners the younger and better educated members. These are usually the ones who pay school fees and undertake to meet most household expenditures. It was, therefore, not surprising to find these relatively young people posing as guardians.

A large number of our respondents (70%) were female. Two distinct observations can be made about this: One, that women have been noted to participate more in community and government development programs than men (ATIP, 1985). This may be because they are usually the household member(s) who are not formally unemployed, and therefore readily available in the home (Labor Survey, CSO, 1986). And, two, education activities and meetings often are the responsibility of women in the more traditional division of household labor.

Occupation

We did not ask households to provide us with estimates of their annual incomes, important as this information is to a study concerned with financing education. There were two reasons why we omitted to seek that data: Firstly, previous studies have found it extremely difficult to obtain reliable figures on household income and expenditure from small samples. Secondly, we knew CSO had just completed a nationwide survey of household income and expenditure. After reviewing their questionnaire we felt that part of their data would be appropriate for our needs. The occupational distribution of the SLEC survey sample is shown in Table 12.

Table 12

Occupations of the Sample

Village/ Town	Mine Wrkr.	Tchr.	Frmr.	Shop Ass.	Civil Serv't	Med. Serv.	Other
Gaborone	11	25	41	20	87	22	291
F/town	7	12	18	21	32	3	16
Serowe	8	20	52	6	17	5	74
Molepolole	37	15	52	3	2	7	85
Kanye	44	21	44	7	12	4	63
Good Hope	0	11	9	2	4	2	13
Mahalapye	1	2	16	2	7	1	9
Letlhakeng	5	2	13	2	-	-	-
Sikwane	2	1	1	-	-	1	4
Total	115	99	246	63	161	45	710

At least 483 (33.6%) of the respondents held a formal sector job as either a teacher, civil servant, medical officer, mine worker (laborer) or shop assistant. The rest of the respondents were farmers, housewives, street vendors/hawkers or self-employed artisans.

Knowledge of the Partnership Policy and CJSSs

The Partnership Policy is officially regarded as an agreement between the central government and the nation's communities. Under the policy, CJSSs are not exclusively owned by either government or individual communities. Rather, as their name suggests, the schools are a joint venture where central government provides teachers, and academic buildings while the community provides at least three of the expected eight teacher's quarters and other non-academic buildings (kitchen, store-room, assembly hall, and students hostels – the latter is optional in the case of schools in large villages and towns). The management of the schools is a joint responsibility.

In addition to questions on basic household characteristics, the interview included questions on the Partnership Policy and other government education policies, the perceived role of the Community Junior Secondary School (CJSS), the quality of facilities in these schools, attitudes towards their performance and knowledge about their management. The theoretical position of the study had been that communities are generally rational actors, in that they will most usually act in a manner that will maximize their returns and benefits. Here, returns and benefits are defined in terms of education to the community's children, service by teachers and students to the community, community access to school facilities, the presence of the school as a marketing outlet for community products, and providing employment opportunities to members of the community.

In this context, our assumption is that if the CJSS has a clearly realizable role to play both for the benefit of the individual child and for the community, then the community will actively support it. Furthermore, if the government policy is intended to improve these schools, then the community will generally be willing to support such a policy.

The critical variable in these assumptions was a community's information or knowledge about both the school and the government policy. As it is clear that the evaluation of the school's role in, and their support of, government policy will revolve around the understanding that the community has about those factors. And indeed, it may matter how and from whom they are informed about these matters. The individual informant, be he the chief, the local politician, or the education or council officer, will make a difference in the nature of the interpretation of the policy they provide the community. Politicians normally want to gain political mileage from the construction of a school or from its performance, while the chief may put pressure on his community to participate in the name of community/village development or they may place their priority on some other development project such as the construction of the kgotla (Tribal Assembly Place) or the building of a clinic.

Of the 1,449 respondents, 824 (56.9%) had neither heard about the partnership policy nor read about it. The remaining 43.1% had heard or read about the policy in newspapers (61 respondents), on the radio (220), at kgotla meetings (250), from Ministry of Education publications (26), from friends (121) and from other sources such political rallies, conferences, etc. (88). It is important to note that only 141 (less than 10%) of the respondents had either heard or read about the policy from more than one source.

On the specific aspect of the policy relating to the role of the schools' Boards of Governors, only 196 (13.6%) knew that part of the board's job was to raise money for the CJSS. As few as 383 (26.5%) were able to say the board's role was to manage the CJSS in their area. Only 289 (20.0%) of the respondents said the community was represented in the school management. Altogether 599 (41.3%) knew of the existence of the school boards.

Lack of knowledge about the partnership policy raises several questions relating to GOB's chosen methods of communicating with the population. What was especially disconcerting was discovering that a large number of teachers, civil servants, and politicians were not conversant with this policy. Officials of the Ministry of Education, however, believed that communities were consulted in the process of designing the policy. They also stated that thereafter the Minister would address Kgotla meetings regarding the Partnership Policy.

Asked to comment on the relevance of the curriculum, 1,081 (74.8%) of the respondents did not have an idea whether it was relevant or not. Only 67 (4.6%) were able to say categorically that the curriculum was not relevant either to the needs of the individual child or the community. Asked to evaluate the quality of desks, chairs, etc., in CJSS in terms of whether they were good, adequate, satisfactory or bad, 838 (57.8%) had no idea, 191 (13.2%) felt they were in good conditions and 100 (6.9%) said they were unsatisfactory.

On the rating of teaching materials in CJSS many respondents (948) were unaware of what materials were available in the schools. From those who had some idea the responses were: 188 (13.0%) said they were good, 164 (11.4%) adequate, and 107 (7.4%) unsatisfactory. Responses to issues relating to sports facilities, school accommodation, quality of teachers, attitudes of the headmaster and teachers to the community reflected a general lack of knowledge on these points. For parents and teachers the most worrying thing about their local CJSS was the lack of hostel accommodation. They claimed children were often harassed by drunken villagers at night on their way home from evening studies. They were equally concerned that village accommodation was poor and inadequate (see Tsayang, 1988 on a related issue).

Interestingly, when asked to rate examination results, close to 40% of the respondents said they were good to satisfactory, 35.7% did not know, while only 27.4% said they were unsatisfactory. Undoubtedly, this reflects a positive change in attitudes toward CJSS. In the past CJSS were notorious for poor performance, and not many parents would, given the choice, send their children there. Admittedly, most of the current CJSSs are new and are establishing their own images in their respective communities. However, the name CJSS is old, and is generally associated with the earlier, poorer schools (Molutsi, 1988). On the other hand, the performance of most CJSSs in the past two or three years has been impressive and could have easily made positive impressions on the communities (see Hartwell, 1988; Kahn, 1988 on the recent performance of CJSS vis-à-vis government secondary schools).

Role of CJSS

Respondents were asked to state what they considered to be the functions of the CJSS. The majority 752 (52.1%) said the main function of the CJSS is to provide children access to secondary education. The remaining 692 (47.9%) did not think access to secondary education should be the primary reason or role of these schools. Forty percent (573) of the respondents said the function of the CJSS should be to prepare the child to serve the community, while 872 (60.2%) did not consider that an important function of the school. Asked whether the CJSS in the locality did perform these functions 593 (41.1%) of the respondents said it provided access to secondary education and 850 (58.9%) thought otherwise. Again, some 40% of the respondents felt the school was preparing children to serve their communities.

Under the Partnership Policy, the CJSS is to cease being a "white elephant" distanced from the community. The new school is required to open up to the community by sharing school facilities with the local community. When possible communities can use school halls, classrooms, kitchen, etc., for meetings, literacy classes, as study centers and for community functions and entertainment. We asked the respondents to say whether school facilities were being used by the communities. Only 60 (4.2%) said the school did open its facilities to the community. The majority of the respondents 1,381 (95.8%) claimed that the school was isolated from the community in this regard. Not many people felt the school should play any direct role in community development. Fifteen percent of the respondents felt this should be one of its functions, and about the same percentage (14.7%) said that the school was participating in development activities.

Providing Support to the CJSS

Asked whether they had been asked to help the school in their area 648 (44.9%) of respondents said yes. However, almost all of this help went to primary schools. Less that 20% of the respondents had ever helped a CJSS in their locality. When asked who approached them to help the school, the responses were as shown in Table 13.

It appears that slightly under half of the sample have not been asked to contribute to the development of the CJSS in their area. The strongest link between the school and the community is the traditional one, the headmaster. However, this link is restricted in that the headmaster usually has contact only with parents who have children in his school. Hence the number of 332 approximates the 255 which is the number of parents with a child at CJSS (see Table 14).

Those that are supposed to be responsible for mobilizing community resources for the school, namely the chief, the members of Parliament, the PTAs, and above all the Boards of Governors (which frequently include the chief, the MP and the District Commissioner), appear to be playing an insignificant role in this regard. (Problems associated with Boards of Governors as CJSS managers are addressed in the next chapter.)

Table 13
Sources of Requests to Help CJSSs

Source of Request	Frequency	Percentage of Total Sample
Member of Parliament	27	1.9
Councillor	33	2.3
V.D.C. Member	15	1.0
Parent Teacher Association	80	5.5
Board of Governors	32	2.2
Chief	41	2.8
Teacher/Headmaster	332	22.9
Child	179	12.4
Other	47	3.2

Overall only 271 (18.7%) of those questioned said they ever gave money, labor, or equipment, etc., to the local CJSS. Some 807 (56.3%) said they were involved in other community development activities, that included contributing to the construction of the Kgotla, supporting the primary school, working at the clinic, and/or on drought relief – all usually labor-intensive projects. Of those who already gave assistance to the CJSS, 265 (18.3%) said they could provide more.

As noted earlier, communities will normally support a project that they either initiated themselves or which is seen to be of benefit to them. The Partnership Policy is considered a brainchild of the central government by communities and although in the past government jointly supported some private (generally mission owned) schools where the management was left to the owners and government played no role in the CJSS enterprise except through legislation, what emerges now is therefore new to the communities. The question arises as to whether the communities have accepted this imposed innovation. If the answer is yes, then questions need to be raised as to why communities appear reluctant to support these schools.

Participation in school activities appears, as one would expect, to be closely linked to having a child at that school. Some 468 (32.3%) of those interviewed no child in primary school. The remaining 68.7% had between 1 and 6 children in primary school, though the majority had only 1 or 2 children there. However, only 255 (17.6%) of the respondents had a child(ren) at a CJSS, and 213 (14.7%) of respondents had a child(ren) at senior secondary school. Slightly under 10% of the respondents had a child in postsecondary education.

CJSS and Community Involvement

The present CJSSs are new, they have not as yet made any significant impact on the development of the communities in which they are located. Moreover, there are no clear indications that they will do so in the future. Teachers and students, as well as parent communities still largely perceive these schools as "centers of learning" and as nothing else.

Table 14

Number of Children at CJSS

	Number of Children at CJSS (Percentage)			
Village/Town	**0**	**1**	**2**	**Total**
Gaborone	403(81)	86(17)	10(2)	499(100)
Francistown	220(86)	28(11)	9(3)	256(100)
Serowe	151(83)	30(17)	1(0)	182(100)
Molepolole	159(79)	36(18)	7(3)	202(100)
Kanye	173(89)	19(10)	3(1)	195(100)
Good Hope	26(84)	2 (7)	3(9)	31(100)
Mahalapye	28(74)	8(21)	2(5)	38(100)
Letlhakeng	24(75)	6(19)	2(6)	32(100)
Sikwane	5(56)	3(33)	1(11)	9(100)
Total	**1,189(82)**	**218(15)**	**37(3)**	**1,444(100)**

Political Issues

The study found that in areas where the opposition parties were strong, CJSS issues were something of a battleground in the political arena. Membership of the Boards of Governors was closely contested along party lines and a defeated party would then not be as likely to support the school. While this may be an expected pattern in a multi-party democracy, very often it has deprived the school of well-qualified personnel. The political climate within the boards has been further heightened by the presence of the local Member of Parliament or his representative as an exofficio member of the board. In some villages respondents saw this as a means of promoting the incumbent and his party.

Administrative Issues

The Partnership Policy is a recent arrival among district administration policies in Botswana. Hitherto local authorities were charged with the responsibility of managing primary schools only. Education personnel in the districts are already overextended with primary education activities alone. They claim that they do not have time for CJSS support activities without lessening their attention to the primary schools. And, in addition, they currently know very little about the new policy and CJSSs in general. The same arguments apply to the District Commissioner's Office.

During the course of this study, it became clear that all extension workers including the two just mentioned, are overwhelmed with CJSS duties. Duties that they do not feel confident to handle. With regard to the DC and the Education Officer they had hardly been able to attend regular board meetings for many CJSSs. Certainly, these support arrangements cannot be promoting better management of the CJSS schools.

6.0 INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

The results presented above indicate that Botswana's educational development may be entering a rather gloomy period in the forthcoming years. Many assumptions that were the basis of the National Commission's recommendations in 1977 and the Partnership Policy of the 1980s, appear to have been simplistic. These included:

- Since communities are hungry for education they will spend a reasonable portion of their household income on educational development.
- That based on past experience, communities do have the resources which, under suitable conditions, can be tapped for the development of education.
- That the local leadership (i.e., chiefs, counselors and administrators) will be keen to mobilize their own people to work for the development of education in their area.
- That communities, through their leaders, have the ability and the capacity to participate in the administration of schools at all levels.
- That policy makers and other stakeholders would be willing to delegate some of their administrative responsibilities to local communities and school authorities.
- That teachers and pupils would recognize and see the value of closing the gap between the school and the community.
- That the provision of a legal instrument to enable the formal decentralization of the education system would alone provide a conducive atmosphere for joint management of schools by the central government and the communities.

Naive as they now appear, these assumptions were noble, they were based on the national development principles of democracy and self-help. They were also premised on the broad post-World War II trends towards devolution and participatory democracy. On the economic side, public participation was intended to ensure that the consumer has not only a say, but also contributes towards the type of education desired. A close relationship between the school and the community was, in addition, intended to ensure that local resources were first utilized before resources were sought from national sources. Communities could provide cheap labor, contribute money, grain and livestock towards the development and sustenance of the school. The school on the other hand could produce and sell vegetables to the community, and work on local development projects (horticultural schemes, cooperatives, etc.). The community and the school could use the same buildings, avoiding duplicate building costs for one community. Finally, it was intended that the school graduate a well-balanced individual capable and willing to work for the betterment of their community.

Moreover, providing cheaper education (at least to central government) was intended to improve access and provide every citizen the opportunity to realize their potential. Thus, there was to be a massive expansion of the system, a harmonization of school and community, better use of facilities (and teachers) in the interest of equity and social justice. Ideally, from a management perspective the CJSS concept reduces the cost, time lapses in the decision making process, and permits flexibility and innovation at a local level.

The SLEC study was partially designed to check whether these assumptions were still valid, whether the objectives set on the basis of these assumptions have been realized, and in the instances where they have not been realized to attempt to explain why. More importantly, the study was designed to recommend how best the objectives of the Partnership Policy can best be implemented. The first objective of this study was thus to check on the extent to which local resources may or may not be a constraint to community participation. In addition, the study set out to assess the extent to which, given the availability of resources, communities were willing to invest in education, and if possibly determine the potential size of that investment.

Following previous surveys on poverty, income distribution and drought (Rural Income Distribution Survey, 1976; Lipton, 1977; Hitchcock, 1978; Wanatabe and Mueller, 1981) this study hypothesized that government may be expecting too much from the communities, especially in rural areas where the major household resources are crop production and livestock. The past six years of drought has been considerably depleted the resources of these communities.

Objective I — Resource Availability and Sustainability

Households were not asked how many cattle, or bags of grain they produced, nor were they asked about other assets. They were, however, subjected to observation of their apparent material wealth based on the condition of their home. The overall impression was that poverty and inequality in Botswana, so well documented in the mid-1970s, is still widespread. The National Household Income and Expenditure Survey came out with the same conclusions (HIES, 1989).

This survey found that urban and rural average monthly incomes were P.505 and P.136, respectively. Average monthly expenditures for the same areas in 1985/86 were P.419 and P.112, respectively. Very little was left for savings, and as much of the difference between income and expenditure can be accounted for by frequent underreporting, the chances that there is disposable income of any dimension is slim.

Poverty and inequality between and within the urban and rural areas is persistent. For example, 35.2% of urban and 66.8% of rural households earned monthly incomes of less than P.200. Even after adjusting for differences in the standards of living between the two areas, the inequality between the two remains well pronounced.

In 1976 the Rural Income Distribution Survey reported the national Gini Coefficient (a measure of inequality) stood at 0.52%. According to HIES (1989) the same measure has increased showing a widened gap in income distribution of 0.556 nationally. Considering purely cash income, i.e., excluding "in kind" income, the results obtained are shown in Table 15.

The inequality is reduced when 'in kind' income is added. It drops quite substantially for rural areas where the extended family is still relatively strong, and payment in kind is still widespread. It also decreases there because government drought relief programs are oriented toward the rural rather than the urban areas. However, it is in rural areas that incomes are more skewedly distributed with a moderated Gini Coefficient of 0.674.

Table 15

Gini Coefficient by Location

Location	Cash	Cash + in Kind
Urban	0.563	0.536
Rural	0.674	0.477
National	0.703	0.556

Source: HIES, 1989.

One measure of both poverty and inequality is housing. The quality and type of a house is an important measure of living standard. In 1984 for example, *A National Housing Needs, Affordability, and Potential Barriers Survey* established that up to 90% of rural household had no sanitation facilities of any kind. In addition, a large number of those that did require upgrading, which was estimated to be completed at the rate of 4,900 units a year over a 20-year period (Clifton, et al., 1984). The HIES (1989) found that 11% of urban housing units had no toilets and up to 72% of the rural houses had no toilets/latrines.

Availability and source of drinking water is yet another measure of the standard of living of people/communities. In Botswana, most of the expenditures on water development for human use is the responsibility of the central and local governments. Only a few rural households can afford a borehole or to bring water into the house. The HIES reported that about 10% of the rural population still drink from rivers and streams. For 40% percent of rural households and 6% of urban households, the main source of water is more than 400 meters from their home. And, 42% of urban dwellers have water piped within their plot compared with only 8% of rural households.

This study found that for the majority of households the major assets were livestock, crops, agricultural machinery, urban homes, trading businesses, and vehicles. These are, however, unequally distributed and the most common ones, crops and livestock, are susceptible to the occasional depletion caused by drought.

In conclusion, we note that although both our survey and that of the CSO were carried out during drought years and may therefore exaggerate poverty and inequality, it is clear that a lack of resources may be a major constraint limiting community support to schools. Although desired, education is not given top priority in the allocation of these scarce resources. On the use of their resources, many respondents said that even under the free education program they were still paying for cooking, library construction (primary schools), kitchen construction, etc. They also reported that they were constantly being overwhelmed with requests for contributions for various other community development projects.

Households may be individually poor but through other means local communities have found funds to contribute to local development. During this study we questioned local leaders, politicians and administrators on the extent of the availability of local resources. The general response was that councils do not have resources to devote to secondary education. It was reported that even primary education is now totally financed by the central government as local councils could no longer afford to pay their part. The following table gives some impression of the extent to which local councils in this country are reliant on the central government for finance.

Table 16

Sources of Revenue for Selected District Councils

Council Name	Area (km2)	Population (1986 est.)	Recurrent Income	Estimates Expenditure	(1986-87) Deficit
Central	142,669	346,371	2,345,200	12,335,820	9,990,620
Ghanzi	117,910	22,149	513,900	2,716,670	2,202,770
Kgalagadi	110,100	28,931	377,650	3,124,240	2,746,590
Kgatleng	7,600	49,545	485,210	2,730,890	2,245,680
Kweneng	38,120	138,757	914,900	4,866,300	3,951,400
North East	5,323	42,032	334,120	2,444,610	2,110,490
North West	130,087	86,225	641,360	4,231,520	3,590,160
South East	1,492	37,185	390,370	1,894,910	1,504,540
Southern	26,876	135,848	640,770	5,114,200	4,473,430
Total	**580,177**	**905,034**	**6,643,480**	**39,459,160**	**32,518,680**

Adapted from: William Tordoff, Local Administration and Development in Botswana. Unpublished paper presented at the Center for African Studies, University of Edinburgh, Dec. 1988, p. 11.

For either communities or local authorities to raise substantial funds for the running of schools does not appear probable. And, if, as expected, this is the case then any reduction of central government funding would therefore significantly affect both the quality of schools and schooling, and have an undesirable impact on current efforts to improve access to secondary education.

A stakeholder in education not adequately addressed in the Partnership Policy is the private sector: The role of business and commerce (which plays an increasing important part in Botswana's development) is not specified, nor are their guidelines for that sector's participation. Clearly, this is an oversight by government, as many communities have successfully raised funds for the construction of CJSSs by appealing to businesses both inside and outside their villages. In fact, much of what has been previously described as community contributions to CJSSs appears to have come largely from the private sector and Foreign Missions in Botswana. However, affirming that, under present conditions, communities do not have resources to invest on education does not mean that they should in the future be totally excluded from any requirement to provide resources. The task at hand in these communities is to develop a means of providing, locally, through a sustainable activity, a regular source of income that can be devoted to education. (The current degree of private sector involvement in subsidizing CJSSs was discovered during interviews with CJSS headmasters and Brigades personnel.)

Objective II – Policy Issues

It is important that education policy is relevant, effective and achievable in order for it to appear practical to the general public, as well as to the junior education officers who are tasked with its implementation. To address this issue the study questioned twenty government officials.

Briefly, education policy-making in this country is supposed to start at the grass roots level with consultation at the Kgotla, Village Development Committees (VDCs), Parent-Teacher Associations (PTA), local authorities, District Councils, Land Boards and the District Commissioners. Once this process is completed, discussions are continued at the Ministry level, and there, depending on the issue, the Ministry may also consult with the private sector, including religious organizations. At the third and final stage, issues go to Cabinet and then back to Parliament, where it most probably originated as a motion from one member.

The policy-making model described above exists in theory only. In practice, policy generally starts within the central bureaucracy, from there, after some internal consultation, it is send to Cabinet which in turn presents it to Parliament as a policy issue for debate. It was this path that was taken by the government as the Partnership Policy was formulated. The Ministry of Education, aware of the grave problems being faced by the community schools, including poor facilities, shortages of teachers, high fees, appalling results, and a generally deplorable level of management, decided to go along with the recommendations of the 1977 Education Commission and intervened. The resultant policy, as described earlier, was intended to improve the CJSSs by providing them with qualified teachers, upgraded buildings, reorganized management, and additional schools.

There have been several problems associated with this policy:

- There was inadequate consultation with the communities that owned the CJSSs.
- There was only limited dissemination of information on the policy to the public, and central and local government officials.
- The policy was rather abruptly introduced, and in a number of cases it interrupted improvements being made in some schools. As a result communities felt they were being shunted by central government.
- The policy articulated no consideration for events already taking place at the local level. Those expected to facilitate the implementation of the policy such as the chief, councillors, council staff and central government extension officers were already overwhelmed with development projects.
- There are too few education officers in the districts, and those that are there are concerned with primary schools. The addition of CJSS responsibilities to their workload has resulted in a heavy administrative burden that has lessened their potential effectiveness in both areas.
- District Commissioners have found themselves having to address CJSS administration matters without adequate information on the system.

A concern often raised, though it is not a 'fault' of the policy implementation process, is the political turn that educational administration at the CJSS local level has taken. Many politicians regard the introduction of Boards of Governors as a legitimate forum in which to express and advance their political goals. In some areas tense struggles have emerged over the control of these boards. The more negative aspect of this has been the situation where the community failed to support the CJSS, as they viewed the Board as being led by politicians (which they may not support), for political reasons.

The pressure on the local leadership and the absence of more literate people at a local level, combined with local political struggles have resulted in the establishment of ineffective, inexperienced, and less educated Boards of Governors. Their input to the management process at the CJSS is marginal at best. Table 17 illustrates the level of education of selected school board members.

Table 17

School Boards of Governors by Levels of Education

Level of Education	Managers	Deputy Managers	Treasurers	Members
Primary	5(a)	2	3	20
Junior Secondary	2	3	3	5
Senior Secondary	2	4	-	4
Pri. Tcher. Training	4	3	-	6
Other (Diploma, Degrees)	1	2	6(b)	1
Not stated	3	2	4	-

Notes: (a) Most members completed the old primary education cycle that ranged from Std IV to Std VI; i.e., about 5-8 years of formal schooling.

(b) Almost all treasurers, bursars had undergone a special short course arranged by the Ministry of Education.

As they are currently constituted, the Boards of Governors cannot be expected to make any substantive input on the management of the schools. Some headmasters even reported them to be a headache, as they do not attend meetings and are sometimes needlessly uncooperative.

On a positive note, Boards of Governors have been formed and many are developing the skills required to meet the responsibilities they are charged with. If the Ministry of Education continue their recently introduced workshops, and set a target of upgrading and better informing board members, then that pattern should continue and the CJSSs can only benefit. There is a need for a National CJSS Association of Boards of Governors – such a forum could promote training and information exchange among its membership.

It may also be necessary to review the current legislation on the constitution of the boards. Some officers, especially non-functioning ex officio members, should be dropped and teacher representation included (apart from the headmaster and his deputy, teachers are not represented on the boards). Maybe a member each from the local business community and local church could be made new ex officio members, if not full members of the boards.

The Ministry should also consider developing a Regional Education Office for Secondary School Affairs staffed by an education officer as supervisor, two middle-level education administrators (DSE or equivalent) and three or four junior clerks (extension personnel). The latter could be trained to work as education extension workers for CJSS and their boards.

Objective III – Effectiveness of the Education System

The third objective of this study was to evaluate the curriculum. However, it was realized that there were a number of ongoing studies in this area, and the decision was made to redirect the intended efforts in this area toward the remainder of the study.

Indications are that parents and community leaders are becoming increasingly concerned about the ineffectiveness of the school system. In a video report (Quambi, 1988) in which SLEC participated, parents, teachers and community leaders expressed serious reservation on the number of children who complete primary and secondary school but enter the workforce ill prepared. They recommend more practical subjects to be included in the curriculum, and they said more technical schools are needed at a post-junior secondary level.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study did not set out with clearly defined hypotheses. It was a descriptive study, and as such suggests caution if any generalizations are to be made from the findings.

The first central objective of this study was the assessment of availability and sustainability of local resources. On the basis of the data gathered and the results of the Survey of the Household Income and Expenditure Survey, we can safely conclude that at the moment local resources are very limited. Neither households nor local authorities appear to have adequate resources to invest in education. Most households are barely above the most conservative levels of poverty. Preoccupation with the basic necessities of life considerably limits participation of all forms in educational development.

By its nature, the major community resource, livestock, is unsustainable. Under regular mild to severe droughts, many households have had their base of cattle, small stock, etc., depleted. Many households which were relatively well off a few years ago are now on the verge of poverty. We therefore conclude that, as a source of school income, livestock alone can not be relied upon. Until local economies have diversified and output increased on a consistent basis, the local resource base will remain narrow and susceptible to a wide range of external influences.

Financial or material support is only one of the many ways local communities can participate in educational development. Communities can provide their labor to the schools. They can ensure that curriculum is made relevant and that scarce resources are optimally used. Communities, religious missions and the private sector can assist in improving the efficiency of the system. However, during the course of this study, we found that among the major obstacles to community participation is the lack of managerial skill in the communities. Given the general low levels of education in the country, members of the schools' Boards of Governors are on the whole less-educated than would be minimally desirable, and as such their contribution to school management remains marginal.

The second objective of the study was the analysis of the existing policy instrument. The Partnership Policy, introduced in the mid-1980s, was found to be flawed. Firstly, the policy was not based on adequate information regarding ongoing events at the local level. As a result, it was highly presumptuous in respect to what communities could or could not afford. Secondly, the policy was not based on consultation and communication with other stakeholders in the education process. The partnership being advanced was neither negotiated nor agreed upon. Instead, it was proposed by the central government bureaucracy and implemented by an ill-informed local government personnel. Consequently, the policy has faced resistance and distortion, both of which could have been avoided.

However, now that it is in place, and under it new structures have been created, there is a need to strengthen, to reorganize, and to coordinate these institutions with similar institutions with the intention of improving their overall performance. More definition is required as to what local structures are supposed to do vis-à-vis central MOE and government. The revision of the 1978 Education Act is long overdue, that legislation needs to be clear, elaborate, and definitive on CJSS of management issues.

The idea of community-school integration is a noble one but also one which reflects a romantic and perhaps impractical element. It is a long-term goal requiring concentrated effort from both sides. So far, nothing seems to indicate that the process of joint participation and responsibility is taking place. CJSSs are still largely isolated from their host communities, and the communities are unaware of what is happening in the school.

Community Junior Secondary Schools need to do much more in the area of practical activity to attract community attention. They could produce and sell more vegetables, repair some simple farm and household implements in their workshops, mount vegetable and crop production workshops for members of the community through their 4H clubs. They could also have open days and occasional evening public lectures on issues of relevance to community development. A number of CJSSs do produce vegetables, though mainly for the purpose of meeting agricultural science examination requirements.

The gap that exists between the CJSS and the community is largely attributable to a leadership vacuum. Community leaders including chiefs, counselors, members of Parliament and local and central government officers appear not to be adequately motivated. If change is to occur and communities are to consistently take an active role in providing resources for their CJSS, then this vacuum must be filled, for without proactive, solid, and reliable leadership in this venture, at the community and local government level, then the Partnership Policy is destined to fail.

Attachment: Interview Schedule

BOTSWANA

STRENGTHENING LOCAL EDUCATION CAPACITY (SLEC)

GENERAL SURVEY MAY – JULY 1988

Name of Interviewer________________________________

Date of Interview _____/_____/_____

Checked by____

Census ID_________________ SLEC ID____________________

1. Name______________________________ SLEC ID #__________________

2. District/Village: [mark only one box]

☐ 1 Gaborone
☐ 2 Francistown
☐ 3 Serowe
☐ 4 Molepolole
☐ 5 Kanye
☐ 6 Good Hope
☐ 7 Gumare
☐ 8 Kang
☐ 9 Sikwane

3. Grouping: [mark only one]

☐ 1 Tswana
☐ 2 Herero
☐ 3 Kalanga
☐ 4 Other African tribe, specify______________________________
☐ 5 Asian (born in Africa)
☐ 6 Other nationality, specify______________________________

4. Occupation of major breadwinner:______________________________

(If retired, also record last occupation)
Special circumstances______________________________

5. Age:__________

6. Sex: ☐ 1 Male ☐ 2 Female

7. Highest level of education completed: [mark only one]

☐ 1 University/Polytechnic
☐ 2 Teacher Training/Professional Training College
☐ 3 Secondary
☐ 4 Junior Secondary
☐ 5 Primary
☐ 6 Primary – attended but not completed
☐ 7 No formal education – but attended nonformal
☐ 8 Attended literacy classes
☐ 9 No education

8. How many of your children attend the following: [write actual number or 0]

Primary school______________________________
CJSS______________________________
Senior Secondary______________________________
Other type of school______________________________
Specify type______________________________

9. If no children at CJSS, why is this? [mark only one]

(a) ☐ 01 None are of the correct age

(b) ☐ 02 Did not wish any to attend – poor exam results
☐ 03 Did not wish any to attend – poorly qualified staff
☐ 04 Did not wish any to attend – poor facilities
☐ 05 Did not wish any to attend – distance
☐ 06 Did not wish any to attend – accommodation
☐ 07 Did not wish any to attend – other reason, specify reason______________________________

(c) ☐ 08 Were not admitted – low grades
☐ 09 Were not admitted – other reason, specify reason______________________

(d) ☐ 10 Child(ren) already completed CJSS

10. What are the most important functions that a CJSS can perform in serving its host community?

[mark as appropriate]

☐ 1 Providing access to CJSS education
☐ 2 Educating children who will serve the community [mark when specifically mentioned]
☐ 3 Educating children [mark when given as a general statement]
☐ 4 Opening their facilities to the community (classrooms, chairs, teachers, etc.)
☐ 5 Helping in the community development effort
☐ 6 Other, specify____
☐ 7 Don't know

11. Which of the functions that you have listed are carried out by your local CJSS?

[mark as appropriate)

☐ 1 Providing access to CJSS education
☐ 2 Educating children who will serve the community
☐ 3 Opening their facilities to the community (classrooms, chairs, teachers, etc.)
☐ 4 Helping in the community development effort
☐ 5 Other, specify____
☐ 6 None of the above
☐ 7 Don't know

12. How relevant do you think the curriculum at the CJSS is to the student's future life?

[mark only one]

☐ 1 Relevant
☐ 2 Partly relevant
☐ 3 Not very relevant
☐ 4 Don't know

13. How would you rate the following facilities in the local CJSS?

	Good	Adequate	Un-Satisfactory	Don't Know
Buildings	☐	☐	☐	☐
Desks and chairs	☐	☐	☐	☐
Teaching Materials	☐	☐	☐	☐
Sporting Facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐
If applicable, accommodation	☐	☐	☐	☐

14. How would you rate the following at your local CJSS?

	Good	Adequate	Un-Satisfactory	Don't Know
Number of teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐
Quality of Teachers/Hm.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Attitude of Teachers/Hm.	☐	☐	☐	☐
School (Examination) Results	☐	☐	☐	☐

15. Apart from the processes of formal education (actual schooling) do you know of any other activities (relationships) between the CJSS in your village and the community?

☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No

If yes, what are these activities [mark as appropriate]

☐ 1 Joint community/CJSS self-help activities
☐ 2 Joint community/CJSS sporting and entertainment activities
☐ 3 Community use of CJSS facilities
☐ 4 Community financing of CJSS activities
☐ 5 Community participation in school administration (e.g., through Board of Governors)
☐ 6 Other activity, specify activity____________________

16. Have you ever been asked to help the school(s) in your area?

☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No

If yes, and you contributed in some way, for what type of school and did you have a child there?

[mark as appropriate]

☐ Primary	☐ Child there	☐ No child there
☐ Junior Secondary	☐ Child there	☐ No child there
☐ CJSS	☐ Child there	☐ No child there
☐ Secondary	☐ Child there	☐ No child there
☐ University	☐ Child there	☐ No child there

And, who asked you to help? [mark as appropriate]

☐ 1 Member of Parliament
☐ 2 Councillor
☐ 3 Village Development Committee (VDC)
☐ 4 Parent-Teacher Association (PTA)
☐ 5 School Board Member
☐ 6 Chief
☐ 7 Headmaster/Teacher
☐ 8 Other, specify____________________

17. Are you, or have you been, supporting the local CJSS in any way?

☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No

If yes, complete the table below indicating the type and duration of the support provided.

[mark as appropriate]

Type of Support	**Is support given regularly**	**If support only given once, and year of contribution**	**If money, (amount, if told)**	**Was the support requested**	
				Yes	**No**
Financial contribution	☐	☐ Yr____	P_____	☐	☐
Supply of building (if offered) equipment	☐	☐ Yr____		☐	☐
Supply of other equipment	☐	☐ Yr____		☐	☐
Labour – for fencing	☐	☐ Yr____		☐	☐
Labour – for brick making	☐	☐ Yr____		☐	☐
Labour – for clearing land	☐	☐ Yr____		☐	☐
Provision of firewood	☐	☐ Yr____		☐	☐
Administrative support, specify____________________	☐	☐ Yr____		☐	☐
Other type of support, specify____________________	☐	☐ Yr____		☐	☐

If no, why have you not helped the CJSS? [mark only one]

[] 1 Was not asked – would help if asked.
What support could you give?____________________
[] 2 Was not asked – would not help if asked – Government responsibility.
[] 3 Don't see how I (my family) would benefit from helping
[] 4 No children in the school
[] 5 Have problems with the school authorities.
Specify which authorities____________________
[] 6 Have nothing to offer
[] 7 Other reason, specify reason____________________

18. **Ask if applicable.** If you have already contributed in some way to the CJSS, could you give more support if it were requested?

[] 1 Yes [] 2 No

What form could that support take?____________________

19. Are you involved in any other community development activity on a contributory basis?

[] 1 Yes [] 2 No

If yes, indicate those that you are involved in and the type of involvement that you have.

[mark as appropriate]

	Number of days worked	**Financial contribution**
Building of clinics	______	P______
School construction	______	P______
Kgotla construction	______	P______
Other	______	P______

specify____________________

20. What specific measures do you think can be adopted to make he CJSS serve the best interests of the community?

____

____

____

21. Do you think that your community has resources to contribute to assist in the support of the CJSS?

[] 1 Yes [] 2 No [] 3 Don't know

If yes, what do you feel it could offer, please be specific?

____

____

____

22. Are you familiar with Government's Partnership Policy on education?

☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No

If yes, how did you learn about this? [mark as appropriate]

☐ 1 From national newspapers
☐ 2 From the radio
☐ 3 At Kgotla meetings
☐ 4 From official government publications
☐ 5 From friends
☐ 6 From other sources, specify________________________________

23. What do you understand to be the role of the Board of Governors of a CJSS?

[mark as appropriate]

☐ 1 To raise money an support for the school
☐ 2 To jointly manage the school with the headmaster
☐ 3 To represent the community in the school
☐ 4 Other function(s), specify________________________________
☐ 5 Don't know

24. The government now has a free education policy. What does this mean to you?

☐ 1 I have no idea
☐ 2 Tuition is now paid by government
☐ 3 Tuition and living expenses will be paid by government
☐ 4 All education costs will be paid by government
☐ 5 Government will pay tuition and give a subsistence allowance to students
☐ 6 Government will pay all costs and provide a subsistence allowance to students
☐ 7 Other, specify____
____

25. Ask only if applicable; i.e., respondent has children at school. Under the free education scheme, are you still required to make payments for the secondary education your children receive?

☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No

If yes, which of the following are you paying for, and how much?

[mark as appropriate]

☐ 1 Book fees	Amount P______	per ______
☐ 2 Uniform fees	Amount P______	per ______
☐ 3 Sports fees	Amount P______	per ______
☐ 4 Library fees	Amount P______	per ______
☐ 5 Laboratory fees	Amount P______	per ______
☐ 6 Transportation fees	Amount P______	per ______
☐ 7 Accommodation fees	Amount P______	per ______
☐ 8 Repair and replacement fees	Amount P______	per ______
☐ 9 Other fees, specify type________________________________	Amount P______	per ______

26. In the past who has been responsible for paying the school fees for secondary payments? [mark only one]

☐ 1 Parents/Relatives
☐ 2 Government
☐ 3 District/Town Council
☐ 4 Other, specify________________________________

27. In the past how did you raise school fees and other education charges?

[mark as appropriate]

☐ 1 From livestock sales
☐ 2 From crop sales
☐ 3 From my (our) salary or wages
☐ 4 From my (our) savings
☐ 5 From remittances from relatives
☐ 6 From other sources, specify________________________

Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems Project

POLICY RESEARCH INITIATIVE

STRENGTHENING LOCAL EDUCATION CAPACITY

INDONESIA

PHASE I   STATUS REPORT

Dr. Mohammed Romli Suparman
Balitbang Dikbud

May 1988

Table of Contents

Page

1.0 Introduction . . . . A 3–7
  1.1 General Discussion . . . . A 3–7
  1.2 Nine-Year Basic Education Research Issues . . . . A 3–8
  1.3 SLEC Objectives and Expected Outcomes . . . . A 3–8
2.0 Project Organization . . . . A 3–9
  2.1 Methodology . . . . A 3–9
    2.1.1 Focusing Phase I . . . . A 3–9
    2.1.2 Designing Phase I . . . . A 3–10
    2.1.3 Collection and Analysis of Documents . . . . A 3–10
    2.1.4 Group Discussions . . . . A 3–11
    2.1.5 Resource Requirement Projections . . . . A 3–12
    2.1.6 National Workshop . . . . A 3–12
  2.2 Management . . . . A 3–12
3.0 Education System and Schools' Curricula . . . . A 3–13
  3.1 National Goals . . . . A 3–13
  3.2 Administration . . . . A 3–13
  3.3 Structure . . . . A 3–14
  3.4 School Curricula . . . . A 3–15
    3.4.1 Standardization . . . . A 3–15
    3.4.1.1 Underlying Policy . . . . A 3–15
    3.4.1.2 Process of Curriculum Construction . . . . A 3–15
    3.4.1.3 Curriculum Development and Monitoring . . . . A 3–17
    3.4.1.4 Evaluation . . . . A 3–17
    3.4.1.5 Existing Primary and Junior General Secondary School Curricula . . . A 3–18
  3.5 Problems . . . . A 3–18
4.0 Personnel . . . . A 3–19
  4.1 Personnel Categories . . . . A 3–19
  4.2 Training . . . . A 3–20
    4.2.1 Training of Teachers . . . . A 3–20
    4.2.1.1 Preprimary and Primary . . . . A 3–20
    4.2.1.2 Junior Secondary . . . . A 3–21
    4.2.2 Training Program for Non-teaching Personnel . . . . A 3–21
  4.3 Recruitment of Education Personnel . . . . A 3–22

4.4 Management and Development of Education Personnel . . . . .A 3–23
  4.4.1 Teacher Promotion . . . . .A 3–23
  4.4.2 Inservice Teacher Training . . . . .A 3–24
  4.4.3 Courses for Non-teaching Personnel . . . . .A 3–24
  4.4.4 The Credit System for Teacher Promotion . . . . .A 3–24
  4.4.5 Improved Planning of Teacher Training and Recruitment . . . . .A 3–24
  4.4.6 Supervision and Monitoring of Teachers . . . . .A 3–25
4.5 Primary School Statistics . . . . .A 3–25
4.6 Junior Secondary School Statistics .A 3–26
5.0 Education Facilities . . . . .A 3–27
5.1 Definitions and Specifications . . . . .A 3–27
5.2 Description of Primary School Sarana and Prasarana . . . . .A 3–27
  5.2.1 Types of Primary Education . . . . .A 3–27
  5.2.1.1 Pamong Primary School . . . . .A 3–28
  5.2.1.2 "Small" . . . . .A 3–28
  5.2.1.3 Kejar Paker A Program . . . . .A 3–28
  5.2.1.4 Schools for Disabled Children . . . . .A 3–29
  5.2.2 Schools, Classrooms and Materials . . . . .A 3–29
  5.2.2.1 Supply . . . . .A 3–29
  5.2.2.2 Description of Primary School Classrooms . . . . .A 3–29
  5.2.2.3 Books and Equipment . . . . .A 3–31
  5.2.3 Junior Secondary Schools . . . . .A 3–32
  5.2.3.1 SMP Terbuka . . . . .A 3–33
5.3 Problems . . . . .A 3–33
6.0 Educational Finance: Primary and Junior Secondary Schools . . . . .A 3–33
6.1 The Government Budget . . . . .A 3–34
  6.1.1 The National Government Budget .A 3–34
  6.1.2 The Provincial and District Government Budgets . . . . .A 3–36
6.2 Community Contribution . . . . .A 3–38
6.3 Parental Contribution . . . . .A 3–39
  6.3.1 Primary School SPP . . . . .A 3–39
  6.3.2 Junior Secondary SPP . . . . .A 3–39
  6.3.3 Contributions of Parents Association (BP3) . . . . .A 3–41
6.4 Financing in Private Schools . . . . .A 3–41
7.0 Commentary . . . . .A 3–42
Bibliography . . . . .A 3–48

List of Tables

Page

1. Junior Secondary School Statistics in 1985/1986 . . . . A 3–26
2. Number of SD by Status in Indonesia 1985/1986 . . . . A 3–30
3. Number of Classrooms by Type of School and Ownership 1985/1986 . . . . A 3–31

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Discussion

The development of the education policy in Indonesia is based on the Pancasila philosophy, the 1945 Constitution (Articles 31 and 32), the Broad Outlines of the State Policy (GBHN), and the principle of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika (Unity in Diversity). The Pancasila Philosophy gives direction to the formulation of GOI's educational goals, while the 1945 constitution provides all citizens with the right to education and obliges the government both to design a national system of education and to develop the cultures of the Indonesian nation.

The task of educating the nation is entrusted to the Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC), although in practice other ministries are involved; namely, the Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA), the Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) – partly responsible for primary education, and the Ministry of Manpower (MOM). The management of educational and cultural affairs by several Ministries, together with the varied geographical, social, and cultural environments, serves on the one hand to aid in the development of a national resource potential, while on the other, it tends to constitute a source of complication in the structuring and management of the national education system.

Since the beginning of the First Five-Year Development Plan (Repelita I) in 1969, efforts have been made to improve education, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Reform in curricula, teacher training, the provision of school buildings, and the formulation of the Draft of the National Education Law have been completed. However, the results of these activities have not met MOEC expectations.

In response to MOEC's concerns, a reassessment of various educational policies was made in Repelita IV. In 1984 and 1985, new policies were issued which became the guidelines for the development of education and culture in subsequent years. Considering the results of national development to date, GOI came to the conclusion that it was appropriate to delegate more authority to lower governance units in the education sector. This government intent served as the basis for a policy that permits and encourages a curriculum with a degree of local content and the implementation of the National Final Evaluation (EBTANAS) by local units of MOEC.

A comparative study of learning achievements among the regions and an analysis of educational development in Indonesia made educators even more aware of the need to adjust the curriculum to the respond to the varied geographical, social, and cultural environments. Current MOEC policy now promotes the implementation of a national curriculum that has a 20% local content component for both primary (SD) and secondary (SMTP and SMTA) levels.

In support of the current Labor Law that sets a minimum employment age at 15, and the development of universal primary education (97% of the primary age cohort now attend school) GOI plans to extend the basic education cycle from six to nine years, combining the 6-year SD and 3-year SMTP programs. The nine-year basic education (NBE) program is to be implemented gradually over time. The 1988-89 to 1993-94 period is regarded by MOEC as the NBE planning period, with the intention that in time (perhaps by the middle of Repelita VI) all primary school graduates will have been accommodated at the junior secondary school or equivalent institutions.

It is recognized that the implementation of this policy will require complex and careful planning and coordination among all the parties involved, including the concerned ministries; central, provincial and local governments; communities and parents; social institutions; and private organizations.

The Strengthening Local Education Capacity (SLEC) policy research project was designed to provide MOEC with a base of current, relevant data that would assist in their efforts to identify mechanisms that would facilitate the provision of education services through local and community participation. The SLEC project is structured to provide data for informed policy debate in the context of NBE.

1.2 Nine-Year Basic Education Research Issues

A primary focus of the SLEC research is: What operational activities can be identified that will facilitate the implementation of NBE?

Five issues are identified as being of major concern in implementing NBE:

1. Considering GOI's capacity to provide manpower, infrastructure, facilities, and funds, how should NBE be best implemented? Should a schedule for NBE be introduced simultaneously in all provinces, or would a more incremental introduction be appropriate? The timing of its start-up depends on the capacity of the province concerned.
2. Concerning the supply of teachers: What is the most appropriate method of planning and implementing NBE? Should the preparation and appointment of teachers continue as it is at present or should these processes be regionalized? (A particularly important concern in light of issue 1 above.) Should the level and qualification of SD teachers and SMP teachers be differentiated as they are now, or should they be equalized?
3. What types and degrees of authority/responsibility can be delegated to the MOEC units in the regions and/or local governments, communities and private organizations?
4. How can the capacity of the MOEC units in the regions and/or local governments, communities and the private sector be developed to enable them to carry out the authority delegated to them?
5. How can the participation of parents, local communities, social organizations and private companies be utilized to facilitate the implementation of NBE?

1.3 SLEC Objectives and Expected Outcomes

The overall goal of the SLEC project is to provide relevant data, comprehensive background information, policy recommendations and an analysis of policy alternatives, in order that MOEC policy-makers can select and implement appropriate strategies to develop local and community support for the implementation of NBE and thereby assist in improving access to, and relevance and quality of basic education in Indonesia.

An outcome of the first phase of the SLEC project, this report includes a description of the status of the delivery of education at SD and SMTP levels that addresses personnel, infrastructure and facilities, curricula, and financial support mechanisms.

The second part of the SLEC project, Phase II, will provide data on the extent of regional and community support and/or participation in educational activities.

A product of the SLEC project will be an identification of topics for further policy research to promote regional and community capacity in education, particularly in support of NBE.

It was also intended that the process of preparing this report, using the report as a basis for identifying research foci and conducting sponsored field research, would assist in improving the research competencies and capabilities of the individuals and institutions participating in this study.

2.0 THE ORGANIZATION OF THE SLEC PROJECT

2.1 Methodology

In response to a request from the management of Balitbang Dikbud that they receive products from the project during the two-year study period, the project was divided into two phases: Phase I, a review of the opportunities for and constraints on strengthening local education capacity; and Phase II, a field study, the focus of which would be identified during the latter stages of Phase I.

2.1.1 Focusing Phase I

The first phase of the SLEC project, of which this report is the product, concentrated on a review of the relevant documents that were available in Jakarta, and the three sample provinces of Riau, East Nusa Tenggara and Central Java. Included were:

- Existing policies, procedures and guidelines that influence the participation of the regions in educational activities.
- Research reports and seminar/workshop reports on education.
- Documents pertaining to educational policies at the national, provincial, and local (district, subdistrict, school) levels.
- Documents that provided information on the participation of various elements of society in educational activities.
- SD and SMPT educational statistics from national, provincial, and sample district sources.

The data gathered were intended to help produce the following:

- A description of the provision and utilization of resources in/for SD and SMTP.
- A model (or models) of provision and utilization of resources for NBE. (To be completed at a later date.)
- A preliminary research focus for Phase II of the SLEC project.

The results of the analyses of the available documents and literature, and the projections of resources required for the implementation of NBE are used to describe the status of the supportive capacity of the national, provincial, district, and local community levels.

2.1.2 Designing Phase I

The preparation of the proposal for the Strengthening Local Education Capacity project was the result of a series of discussions between IEES consultants and Balitbang management and staff. The original title of the project, "Decentralization of Education" was at the time considered politically inappropriate for Indonesia, and was changed to "Studi Pengembangan Kemampuan Daerah dalam Bidang Pendidikan" (SPEKDAP) — "Strengthening Local Education Capacity" (SLEC).

The project's Advisory Committee requested that the study focus on the planning aspects of the implementation of NBE within the context of strengthening local capacity to support NBE education activities.

As the results of the analysis of documents forms the basis for determining the research focus of Phase II, the Phase I Report and subsequent workshop became the primary products of Phase I.

2.1.3 Collection and Analysis of Documents

Documents were collected from various units at the central government level, including the Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education, Secretary General of MOEC, Planning Bureau of MOEC, Directorates of Primary and of Secondary Education, Balitbang Dikbud, Directorate of PUOD (General Administration and Regional Authority) of MOHA, and Research and Development Office of MOHA. Documents reviewed consisted of the following: laws, government rules and regulations, policy documents (decrees issued by the President, Minister of Education and Culture, Director General, Secretary General, Governor, Head of Kanwil, etc.), annual reports, research reports, and relevant newspaper clippings. Similar documents were collected from the three sample provinces. Documents were categorized as: (i) organization and management, (ii) curriculum, (iii) personnel, (iv) facilities and infrastructure, and (v) educational financing.

An instrument for summarizing data from the documents, was developed from guidelines taken from Ann Majchrzak's "Methods for Policy Research," and UNESCO's "Training Materials in Education Planning, Administration and Facilities."

The information summarized consisted of:

- Identity of the document.
- Policy issues or important aspects of policies/regulations, whether explicitly or implicitly contained, and their priority.
- Underlying principles of the policies or regulations, including their explicit and latent objectives.
- Definitions used, values and basic assumptions held.
- Constituents affected by the policy/regulation.

- Policy-making and decisionmaking processes.
- Mechanism employed to implement the policy/regulation.
- Organization involved in the decisionmaking.
- Model of policy-making process (if possible).
- Research or effort for improvement that has been conducted prior to the policy/regulation, identity of decision-maker.
- Information about the ways in which the policy/regulation was implemented; fully or with modification.
- Resources required for implementation of the policy/regulation.

Quantitative data of research outcomes and appropriate statistics were recorded in separate tables. The data from each document reviewed has been integrated to compile an annotated bibliography.

Initially, the analysis focused more on revealing the process of policy/regulation making and identifying any preliminary documents to determine the process and reasons for policy changes. However, the Advisory Committee requested that the document analysis be more oriented toward identifying: (i) models that may have been used during the policy development process, and (ii) information on the management of educational personnel, facilities and infrastructures, and financing. A review of research, evaluation, and annual reports provided data on the impact of the policies and regulations at the local level.

This report attempts to limit itself to the areas of personnel, facilities and infrastructure, and finance. However, to be able to analyze these three aspects, it was necessary to review the requirements of the existing curricula as well as the new curricula that are intended to replace them. Therefore, an analysis of curriculum documents was also conducted.

The SLEC research team have worked from the assumption that the most acceptable method of strengthening local capacity to support education (a form of decentralization) is a "deconcentration" of authority; i.e., the tasks and responsibilities of the central units are passed to subordinate units in the regions, either at the provincial, district, subdistrict or school level. Thus, the document analysis focused on collecting information that addresses the potential capacities of these units to respond to additional responsibilities and authority.

"Local education capacity" is viewed as the real and potential capacity of the MOEC units in the regions, the local government, and the community in the areas of organization, personnel, facilities and infrastructure, and financing, to assist in the implementation of NBE.

2.1.4 Group Discussions

A second approach employed to help maintain the project's focus during Phase I was group discussion. Discussions scheduled during Phase I were as follows:

- Project team discussions, consisting of the Country Team Leader, Research Assistant and the two or three Research Assistants associated with the project. Discussions were conducted weekly, and at times experts were invited. Problems pertaining to data collection, analysis, and report writing were discussed in these meetings.

- Advisory Committee meetings, these consisted of 9 people including the Country Team Leader (CTL). The purpose of the committee was to provide an officially approved project guidance procedure that would not only provide a "sounding board" for the CTL, but would articulate GOI concerns through out the study period.
- A "brainstorming" meeting was held to debate project concerns toward the end of the first phase and prior to second meeting of the Advisory Committee. Seven participants representing Balitbang Dikbud, Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education, and USAID Jakarta participated.

2.1.5 Projections of Resources Needed to Implement NBE

To assist in making operational decisions concerning the planning and implementation of NBE, existing statistical data would not suffice. Therefore, quantitative projections of enrollments were made to estimate resource need — personnel, materials and facilities, and funds.

The national enrollment projections made by Balitbang Dikbud and the USAID/EPP Project were utilized. Additional projections were also prepared by the SLEC project staff for the 3 sample provinces. For comparative purposes two projection models were employed. First, projections of SD and SMP student populations following existing student enrollment trends; and second, projections of student enrollment increases at SMTP with a target of all (100%) SD graduates accommodated in SMTP by 1994 (enrollment projections for the 1988-94 period were prepared for illustrative purposes).

Based on these projections, estimates of teacher and classroom needs for the same period were also calculated. Again, two sets of projections were produced. One, on the basis of the current student-teacher and student-classroom ratios in each province, and the other, on the basis of the officially approved student-teacher and student-classroom ratios. These projections were also made for each of three districts in the sample provinces.

2.1.6 National Workshop

The results of this phase of the study were presented at a one-day Workshop in the form of a draft Status Report and a draft proposal for Phase II of the SLEC Study.

At the workshop, key policy issues were discussed and a potential research agenda produced for Phase II. The actual product of the workshop was a series of inputs from the participants that resulted in a more comprehensive report and a more focused Phase II proposal.

2.2 Management

The SLEC Study is financed by USAID in the context of the cooperation between IEES and Balitbang Dikbud.

The CTL, Dr. M. Romli Suparman, is assisted and guided by a nine-member Advisory Committee (see above) chaired by the Head of Balitbang Dikbud, Prof. Dr. Harsja W. Bachtiar. The CTL is also assisted by a Research Associate for Status Review, four assistant researchers, and a secretary.

3.0 THE EDUCATION SYSTEM AND THE SCHOOLS' CURRICULA

3.1 National Goals

The national goal as contained in the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution is "to protect the whole of the Indonesian People and their entire native land of Indonesia and to advance public welfare, to develop the intellectual life of the Nation and to contribute to the implementation of an orderly world which is based on lasting peace, freedom, and social justice." In meeting this goal, the development of the intellectual life of the Nation is the task and responsibility of the national education system.

To attain the goal mentioned above, the 1945 Constitution, Chapter XIII, Education, Article 31 states "(i) Every citizen shall have the right to obtain education, and (ii) The Government shall establish and conduct one national system of education which shall be regulated by statutes." Article 32 states that "The Government shall promote and develop Indonesian national culture."

In accordance with the Presidential Decree of the Republic of Indonesia, No. 45, 1974, MOEC as part of the State Government is assigned to implement part of the general task of the administration and development of education and culture. The 1945 Constitution and the Guidelines of State Policy form the legal basis from which MOEC operationalizes its task.

3.2 Administration

Although the constitution details the need to evolve a single educational system for the nation, Indonesia maintains a diversified system of educational administration: educational matters are not the exclusive responsibility of the MOEC; the Ministry of Religious Affairs, for example, supervises religious schools at all levels, both public and private. Their responsibility includes the "pesantrens," which are traditional community supported religious educational institutions, with a special delivery system dating back to the earliest education institution in Indonesia history. In addition, almost all ministries have their own in-service training institutions at the secondary and tertiary levels.

In terms of curricula, public formal schooling and public nonformal basic education are centrally organized. As previously mentioned, a new policy exists that permits regional and local governments to design relevant curricula to meet local needs.

Neither is education a state monopoly. GOI has continuously encouraged community and private organizations to organize and operate private institutions at all levels, general, vocational and religious, formal and nonformal.

Formal education consists of general education, vocational education, professional education, religious education, and armed forces education:

- General education: prepares the student to obtain basic abilities to continue to further their education or to enter the world of work.
- Vocational education: prepares the student to master skills to enter the world of work and simultaneously to equip them to continue to higher vocational education.
- Professional education: improves the competence of the student to carry out their work tasks.
- Religious education: prepares the student for tasks related to their religious duties.
- Armed Forces education: prepares and enhances the capabilities of the student to carry out their duties as members of the Indonesian Armed Forces.

Nonformal education comprises skill education, education in broadening of outlook, and family education:

- Skill education: prepares the student to carry out certain types of work.
- Broadening of outlook: permits students to widen their intellectual outlook.
- Family education: provides basic knowledge and skills, religion and moral values, and social norms.

3.3 Structure

In terms of levels of education, the existing structure of education consists of: (i) primary education, (ii) junior and senior secondary education, and (iii) higher, or tertiary, education.

(i) Primary education consists of preschool and primary school. Preschool has a maximum three-year program for children before they are seven-years-old. Preschool is not a prerequisite for starting primary school. Primary schooling lasts six years. It is intended for children in the 7-12 age range.

(ii) Secondary education consists of junior and senior secondary school. The former can be general, the Junior General Secondary School (SMP) technical or vocational school. Each lasts three years. Those eligible for junior secondary school, general, technical or vocational, must be primary school graduates. The senior secondary school consists of general, technical, vocational, and teacher training schools. Each has a three-year program, although some technical and vocational senior secondary schools have now started to offer four-year programs. Senior secondary schools are open to SMP graduates. Those finishing technical or vocational junior secondary school can only continue at technical or vocational senior secondary schools.

(iii) Higher education has two types of programs: degree and nondegree. Degree programs are: Stratum 1 (sarjana), Stratum 2 (magistrate), and Stratum 3 (doctorate). Nondegree programs are: Diploma 1, Diploma 2, Diploma 3, Specialist 1, and Specialist 2. Usually nondegree courses are terminal. The degree programs emphasize the academic or professional academic education, while nondegree courses stress professional and practical education.

Nonformal education in Indonesia is implemented through community education in the form of (i) Package A learning groups, and (ii) income generating learning groups. Package A learning groups are directed towards the eradication of illiteracy, while income generating learning groups are directed towards skills education, especially in technical and vocational fields.

3.4 School Curricula

Throughout this report, curriculum is taken in its broadest sense to cover materials, syllabi, delivery methods, evaluation systems, and facilities.

3.4.1 Standardization of Curricula

3.4.1.1 Underlying Policy

The GBHN identifies the basis for institutional objectives of the Primary Junior Secondary School, and on that basis, curriculum is developed. The following are some of the underlying principles of curriculum development:

- Program Flexibility: particularly concerning skills education. Curriculum is developed applying a principle of flexibility in terms of the environment, and the ability of government, society and parents to provide adequate facilities.
- Efficiency and Effectiveness: school time represents only a quarter of the student's time. There will be wastage and eventually inefficiency if this limited time is used for activities that can be completed outside the school. Educational efficiency requires optimal utilization of resources throughout the education process.
- Objective Oriented: each part of the teaching-learning process is to be focused on the attainment of educational objectives.
- Continuity: GBHN states that education is a lifelong process. Primary and secondary schools are related to one another in a hierarchical manner, and in developing the curriculum for these two levels their hierarchical relationship has always been taken into consideration. The implementors of curriculum, particularly teachers, are expected to understand the functional hierarchical relationship between subject content at SD and SMP.
- Lifelong Education: GBHN promotes the principle of lifelong education. School time is not the only time to learn, it is simply a part of the lifelong learning process.

The task of the school, therefore, is not only to pass on knowledge and skills that can be used after the students have completed school, but also to develop attitudes, values, and competencies that will enable continuous learning.

3.4.1.2 Process of Curriculum Construction

Within MOEC, the office responsible for the development of curricula is the Office of Educational and Cultural Research and Development (Balitbang Dikbud), specifically, the Center for Curriculum and Educational Facilities Development. MOEC recognizes two formal stages in curriculum construction; a development stage and a sanctioning stage. The development stage usually involves an experimentation or curriculum content trial period at a chosen school or administrative area. The stage may also involve a number of institutions, for example, Regional Offices of MOEC, a University and/or an IKIP, Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education, and selected headmasters and/or teachers.

The sanctioning stage consists of a policy approval process within MOEC that is usually chaired by the Minister. Once a curriculum change or addition is approved for national implementation, a Ministerial decree is issued.

3.4.1.3 Curriculum Development and Monitoring

The fact that the curriculum for a particular level of education does not remain constant is understandable since there are always changes and improvements in national development policy that in turn impact on education policy. In an attempt to identify changing needs and to be responsive to GOI development policy, MOEC has working units at the national, provincial, district, and school levels that are responsible for monitoring curricula.

The following decrees concern the monitoring of SD and SMTP curricula:

- Ministerial Decree No. 0461/U/1983: The Improvement of the Curricula for Primary and Secondary Education. Since the curricula should constantly be adjusted to the demands of development and advancements in science and technology, it is important to conduct curriculum improvement. The decree refers to the following types of improvement:

  (i) Revision and improvement of the entire curriculum component.

  (ii) Inclusion of the history of the National Struggle for Independence – an important program from preprimary through senior secondary.

  (iii) Provision of a new study program as an effort to meet the needs of development in the world of work.

- Ministerial Decree dated 2 May 1984: Rearrangement of the Time Schedule in the Structural Program of Primary and Secondary School Curricula in accordance with the Establishment of the History of National Struggle for Independence (PSPB).

  To be included as an independent educational program. Under this decree, the time allocation of each level and type of school is arranged.

- Ministerial Decree No. 0508/P/1985: Delegation of authority on behalf of the Minister of Education and Culture.

  Establishes the broad outlines of the teaching learning program (GBPP) of PSPB in preprimary, primary, junior and senior secondary schools under the Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education. The Decree is issued in conjunction with the establishment of PSPB as an independent educational program.

- Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education, MOEC, Decree No. 176/Kep/R/1980: Approval of Utilization of Primary, Junior Secondary and Senior Secondary School Kits.

  This decree is concerned with the equipping of schools with teaching aids. The type and specifications of these kits is controlled by MOEC.

- Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education, MOEC, Decree No. 177/C/Kep/R/81: Approval of Utilization of School Books as Supplementary Textbooks/Resource books/Reading books.

The decree addresses curriculum implementation concerning textbooks. An evaluation team exists to review the books to be used in primary and junior secondary schools.

- Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education, MOEC, Decree No. 028/C/Kep/I/82: Implementation Guidelines for Preparing Annual School Schedules.

  This Decree is reissued every school year, it establishes among other things, the first school day, controlled teaching learning activities, and school holidays.

- Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education, MOEC, Decree No. 020/C/Kep/I/1983: Evaluation Guidelines for School Accreditation. This Decree establishes that curriculum is one of the evaluation criterion of Private Schools (Primary, Junior as well as Senior Secondary Schools).

  This decree could be used to provide support to private schools to better implement an approved curriculum.

To improve continuity in both primary and secondary school curricula, continual curriculum development is carried out. Partly in response to the fact that Indonesian education is varied according to geographical and sociocultural conditions, the following have been undertaken:

- Based on Ministerial Decree, No. 0338/U/1978: The development of the "small school." Here emphasis is on the development of teaching methods designed for primary schools in isolated and less populated areas.
- Based on Ministerial Decree, No. 0339/U/1978: The development of the PAMONG Primary School System. This experiment also developed teaching-learning models by: a) Increasing parent, community and teacher participation, b) Expanding educational services to cover school dropouts, and c) Making use of modular teaching materials.
- Based on Ministerial Decree, No. 034/U/1979: The implementation of the Open Junior General Secondary School Project (Proyek SMP Terbuka). This experiment emphasized the teaching learning process based on the use of radio and local resources. The development of SMP Terbuka is expected to produce an effective and efficient alternate education delivery model.

3.4.1.4 Evaluation

With the intention of obtaining a quality standard for each level of education a national final examination system (EBTANAS) has been implemented. To date, various changes in the evaluation/examination system have taken place. The following examination system has been adopted:

- Government examinations: An examination system in which the content is uniform for each level of education throughout Indonesia.
- School/local examinations: An examination system in which every school is allowed to prepare the content and to conduct the examination.
- Regional examinations: An examination system in which the content is prepared by the schools in a region, and where the examination is conducted simultaneously in that region's schools.
- National Final Examinations (EBTANAS) and Final Examination (EBTA) the existing examination system: An examination system in which exam content is partly standardized by MOEC's central office and partly by MOEC's regional offices.

Three objectives of the EBTANAS are:

1. to create a national standard of quality of primary and secondary education,
2. to accelerate the improvement and universalization of the quality of primary and secondary education, and
3. to support the implementation of the teaching learning process as it is adjusted to the established curriculum, books and other teaching aids. (Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education, MOEC, Decree No. 193/C/Kep/185)

3.4.1.5 Existing Primary and Junior General Secondary School Curricula

The existing primary and junior secondary school curricula, referred to as the 1975 curricula, were established by Ministerial Decree Nos. 008-C/U/1975 and 008D/U/1975, respectively. However, the junior general secondary curriculum has been revised, to become the 1984 curriculum, but to date, the revised curriculum has not been implemented.

The 1975 curriculum contains the following items:

- Institutional objectives and the curriculum structural program.
- The Broad Outlines of the Teaching Learning Program (GBPP), covering:
  a. the formulation of curricular objectives for every field of study,
  b. the general instructional objectives for every field of study, and
  c. the topics for discussions in every field of study (subject matter is constant every year).
- General information on curriculum implementation, comprising of the various definitions and guidelines for applying the curriculum.
- The special guidelines for evaluation, guidance and counseling, administration, and educational supervision.

Critical points of the standardized curriculum are:

- The curriculum applies an objective oriented approach.

  In preparing teaching-learning programs as well as in guiding the students to implement the program, a teacher is required to understand the curriculum's objectives. The delivery method is applied according to the Instructional System Development Procedures (PPSI) which is developed employing a Unit-Lesson methodology.
- The curriculum requires an integrated approach. All courses are required to support the attainment of each other subject's objectives.
- The curriculum emphasizes efficiency and effectiveness of all resource and time utilization.

3.5 Problems

The 1975 curriculum is regarded by educators as overloaded, it reportedly results in students being too task burdened.

It is also reported that there are some subdistricts and individual schools that have not understood and therefore not implemented the 1975 curriculum.

An effort to address these problems was made in the development of the 1984 curriculum. That curriculum involves an integration of various fields of study, and an MOEC approved element of "Local Content" (Muatan Lokal) in the curriculum.

The 1984 curriculum for SMP has, as yet, not been implemented. MOEC expected that upon implementation it will improve the quality of education, and assist in meeting expressed regional concerns about curricular content.

4.0 PERSONNEL

4.1 Personnel Categories

One element of the Indonesian education system that is of critical concern to the SLEC study is personnel. Education personnel are "community members who have the tasks of teaching, training, developing, managing and/or providing technical services in the field of education" (Balitbang Dikbud, 1985:3). They are usually regarded as being in two categories: teachers and non-teachers. Furthermore, based on their function, teachers are classified as either: classroom teachers, subject teachers, or special education teachers. For this project, school principals who manage schools are included as part of the teaching as the majority of them teach.

Categories of non-teaching staff include:

- Managers of education: supervisors, inspectors, and other administrative staff at the subdistrict, district, province, and central office levels.
- Trainers for sports, dance, skills, etc.
- Counselors and therapists.
- Nonformal education personnel.
- Resource persons.
- Technical service personnel: librarians and laboratory technicians.
- Research and development specialists.

This chapter attempts to describe the present personnel management system and the status of primary and junior secondary school personnel (based on data gathered from available documents). The description of each aspect of Personnel will begin with a review of national conditions. This is followed by an illustration of the status in the selected areas.

4.2 Training

4.2.1 Training of Teachers

The Institute of Education Personnel (LPTK) administers various types and levels of teacher education. Preservice training for primary school teachers takes place at the secondary education level, while the training of junior secondary teachers takes place at the tertiary level.

4.2.1.1 Training of Preprimary (Kindergarten) and Primary School Teachers

There are three regular LPTKs and three crash programs providing primary school teacher training:

- Teacher Training for Primary School (SPG) is categorized as a institute for preprimary and primary school teachers with preservice training. Graduates are certified as either classroom or general subjects teachers. Students chose their own specialization, either kindergarten, primary school or general subjects teachers. Course duration is 3-years post-junior secondary. PSGs have been established in all provinces. As the demand for teachers is greater than the supply of SPG graduates in some regions, and as social, economic and cultural differences exist (MOEC regards it as unwise to recruit new teachers from other regions), the Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education permitted a Teacher Training crash program. Provincial offices of MOEC opened one-year Primary School Teacher Training schools, offering "Package C" programs. The students of these programs are graduates of General and Vocational Senior Secondary School. Recently the duration of this training has been reduced to 6 months, and it has become an intensive course.
- Teacher Training for Sports Education (SGO), provides a three-year preservice training course for sports and health education. Crash programs are also permitted at SGO, and are known as Teachers Training "Package A" courses. The candidates for this training are graduates of Secondary School of Sports (SMOA) or SPG. There are also Teacher Training "Package B" courses designed to prepare sports teachers from the graduates of general or vocational senior secondary schools. The graduates of these training courses are placed on the same salary scale and given the same rights as SPG graduates.
- Six-year Religion Teacher Training (PGA-6 Tahun), provides preservice training for religion teachers. There are religion teacher training establishments for Islam, Protestant, Catholic, Hindu, Dharma, and Buddhism. These schools are postprimary. When there is a shortage of qualified religion teachers, school administrators are permitted to recruit senior secondary graduates to teach religious subjects provided they have a letter of authority issued by the relevant religious organization.
- The one year diploma program (D1) in The Institute of Teacher Training and Education Science (IKIP) is a crash program designed to alleviate the serious demand for teachers. This program is only available when the demand for teachers is exceptionally high.

The 1987 school statistics indicate that in 1985/1986 there were 654 SPGs in Indonesia; 215 public and 439 private. The number of SPGs in the 27 provinces vary from 102 in East Java, to 2 in East Timor. Enrollment in public SPG was 132,153 and in private SPG 128,109. Students-school ratio was 615 in the public SPG and 292 in the private SPG. Student-teacher ratio is 17:1 in the public SPG and 13:1 in the private SPG. Among the 17,920 SPG teachers, 51.7% are full-time and 48.3% are part-time. The number of part-time teachers in private schools is 4 times that in public SPGs.

There are 84 SGOs in Indonesia; 53 public and 31 private. Eighteen of 27 provinces have only one SGO. The other provinces have between 2 and 17 SGOs. North Sumatera has 17 SGOs and West Java has 14 SGOs. Student-teacher ratios are 18:1 in public and 13:1 in the private SGOs.

The data above illustrates that there is a diversity between regions in respect to their capacity to produce kindergarten and primary school teachers, and that there is potential for an enlargement of the capacity of private SPGs as the private SPGs have a smaller student-teacher ratio. If the student-teacher ratio of each type of SPG were that of the public SPG, then private SPG enrollment could be increased by 35,000 students.

4.2.1.2 Training of Junior Secondary School (JSS) Teachers

There are 5 institutes offering training programs for JSS teachers:

- PGSMTP, formerly PGSLP, offers a two-year post-grade 12 program.
- Two-year diploma programs (D2)
- AKTA 2 program. This is a one or two semester program that follows a non-teacher training course of at least 4 semesters. Graduates of this program receive the same qualification as graduates of D2 programs.
- Special program for SMTP teachers in Arts. According to Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Schools decree No. 0042C/Kep/I/86, January 1986, the duration of this program has been reduced to four months.
- Strata-1 Program (S1) is a four-year post-grade 12 training program.

These teacher training programs are offered at either IKIPs or FKIPs (College of Teacher Training and Education Science) in a University.

The S1 program is considered the standard training program for JSS teachers, while the others are considered as substandard or crash programs. The standardization of teacher training is now being reconsidered, as the S1 requirement is seen as too difficult. The tendency is to lower the requirement to a standard two-year post-grade 12 training program.

4.2.2 Training Program for Non-teaching Personnel

Only large primary schools have administrative personnel. They are assigned, in many cases, to do clerical jobs or as typists. There are no special preservice training institutions designed to train non-teaching personnel. Recruitment of persons for these positions is based on a formal education certificate plus a skills training course certificate. Normally clerical staff hold an SMTP certificate plus a typing course certificate.

The skills training courses that usually function as a complement to formal school education have a variety of programs of three-months to three-years duration.

Non-teaching personnel at the SMTP level consists of several categories that can be divided into two major groups. The first group is of those that provide technical assistance such as counselors, librarians and laboratory staff. The second group consists of those who provide administrative support. Preservice training for the former group is offered at the IKIPs and FKIPs through the S1 program. Again, there is no training institution for the latter group of non-teaching personnel.

Beside the in-school non-teaching personnel there are many other non-teaching staff who provide services of a technical nature, such as: primary school supervisors, secondary school controllers, etc. In addition, there are also non-teaching staff who work in the provincial, district, and subdistrict offices of the Education and Culture division of local government.

4.3 Recruitment of Education Personnel

The recruitment, promotion, and resignation of civil servants, including education personnel is governed by Act 8, 1974, and succeeding rules and regulations. In addition, each Ministry develops its own operational regulations. Joint regulations are also made between ministries to develop a memorandum of understanding concerning interrelated personnel matters.

Specifications concerning applicants for Primary School teaching positions are:

- Applicants to be primary school teachers are required to have either SPG, SGA or KPG-SD certificates.
- Applicants for Sport and Health Education positions are required to have either SGO, "Package A" program or "Package B" program certificates.
- Applicants for Special Education positions are required to have either SGPLB, PLB Diploma Program, or Bachelor Degree (PLB) certificates.
- Applicants for janitorial positions are required to have at least a primary school certificate.

The religion education teachers in Primary Schools are recruited and administered by the Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA) and they become MORA employees. The religious education teachers under the SD-INPRES scheme are administered by MOEC, and are MOEC employees.

Specifications concerning applicants for Religion Education Teaching positions at Primary School are:

- Applicants should hold a Six-Year Religious Teacher Training (PGA) certificate.
- Applicants should hold a Senior Secondary School certificate, plus a special certificate permitting them to teach religion education.

Primary School Teachers are government Civil Servants assigned to work under the local autonomous government. They are administered and managed both by central and local government agencies: the technical aspects of their work (education related matters) are managed by the provincial offices of MOEC, while the administrative aspects (salary, etc.,) are administered by the regional office of Education and Culture. This dual management causes, in many cases, competition and redundancy of duties between the staff of these two agencies.

Government Regulation No. 12, Article 16, 1967, deals with the arrangements of Civil Service promotion and rotation, including Primary School and JSS teachers. Decree No. 023/p/74 of the Minister of Education and Culture also deals with delegation of authority on rotation of Primary School teachers. The decree states that the rotation of Primary School teachers and non-teaching personnel with salary scales IIc and lower may be authorized by Governors; while the rotation of education personnel with a IId salary scale or higher may be proposed by the Governors, to then be approved by the MOEC.

In 1980 delegation of authority in these matters was given a wider scope. For example, the Governor of Central Java Decree No. 829/3910/1980 authorized the Secretary of Central Java Province Government to sign on behalf of the Governor – re: the promotion of personnel with IId salary scale. The promoting of school personnel at the IIc scale may be authorized by the Head of Provincial Division of Education and Culture; scales IIb and lower by the Head of District Division of Education and Culture.

The transfer of Primary School teachers within the same district is arranged by the Head of District Division of Education and Culture. Transfer between districts should be approved by the Head of the Provincial Division, and transfer between two provinces is arranged by the respective Governors.

In the case of the appointment of a teacher to become a Primary School Headmaster, approval should be given by the Head of Provincial Office of MOEC (Kanwil P dan K). (However, in some cases this office is bypassed, creating tension between the Provincial Division and the Provincial Office of MOEC.)

This ongoing dual management of primary school personnel appears to have a negative effect on teachers. Although this reality has been known by the responsible agencies for some time, little has been done to solve the problem. Both offices do, however, agree that this dual management situation should be eliminated at the subdistrict level. (See recommendation of Primary School Tasks Force, Draft of Primary School Academic Paper, Center of Educational and Cultural Research, 1985.)

4.4 Management and Development of Education Personnel

Act No. 8, Article 12, 1974, states that the management of civil servants is based on career and performance criteria. Moreover, Article 16 of the same Act states that every newly recruited civil servant should complete a probationary period during which their status is one of candidate for Civil Servant (Capeg). During this period they are eligible to have two weeks intensive inservice training. Attendance at such a session is necessary in order to get a formal certification letter indicating the passing of the probationary period.

4.4.1 Teacher Promotion

Once appointed as civil servants teachers will receive biannual salary increases, and every four-years a regular rank promotion. In the early stage of their career, the rank promotion of a teacher is dependent on the evaluation report of their performance and conduct during the previous four-year period. This report is written by the primary school supervisor on the Work Performance Evaluation Sheet (DP3). Until recently, if the required performance and conduct criteria were met, the headmaster proposed that the teachers received a rank promotion. In order to better motivate teachers, this procedure has been made automatic. Salary increases are also automatic.

Only if there is a special recommendation from the District Office of MOEC not to give a promotion will it be postponed.

4.4.2 Inservice Teacher Training

In order to improve the quality and competencies of teachers, various inservice training programs/projects have been carried out by MOEC. Among these are:

- Training of Subject Matter Teachers.
- Fellowships/Scholarships and Study Permit Programs.
- Teacher Work Improvement Group (PKG).
- Inservice Training for School Headmaster Candidates.

4.4.3 Training for Non-Teaching Personnel

The following training courses are offered to candidates for administrative leader positions, SEPADA, SEPALA, SEPADYA, and SESPA. SEPADA is the basic training level that concentrates on the specific skills relevant to staff administration. SEPALA is the second training level that offers programs relevant to the needs of those trainees intending to hold the position of echelon IV leadership (the lowest leadership position within MOEC). SEPADYA is the intermediate training program, while SESPA is an advanced level program offered to personnel who are to hold the highest (echelon I) and the second highest (echelon II) leadership positions at either provincial or central MOEC offices.

4.4.4 The Credit System for Teacher Promotion

Because of the closed formation system of salary scale and ranks at the primary schools many teachers who hold Bachelors or Masters degrees have moved to either JS or SS schools, causing the primary school system to lose qualified teachers. To overcome this problem, MOEC established a credit system for promotion – a similar structure exists in the higher education system. Opportunities now exist for the qualified, productive and innovative teachers to gain promotion every two years.

4.4.5 Improved Planning of Teacher Training and Recruitment

Due to the universalization of primary education and the resultant increase in secondary school enrollment there is an increasing need to recruit a large number of new teachers each year. The demand for teachers in remote areas and outer islands has created an increasing call for the regionalization of integrated training and recruitment of teachers. The regionalized system of teacher training has the following characteristics:

- It recruits the preservice teacher training students from the areas where the greatest demand for teachers exist.
- It establishes preservice training institutions in areas where students reside.
- It limits the number of students to meet only the demand of the area which is covered by the institution concerned.

4.4.6 Supervision and Monitoring of Teachers

The supervision and monitoring of primary school teachers and headmasters is conducted by primary school supervisors (Peniliks). On average each Penilik is responsible for supervising 15 schools. The number of Peniliks in a subdistrict varies from one to four, depending on the number of schools in the districts (including public and private SDs, and Kindergartens). In urban areas, schools are located relatively close to one another; whereas, in rural subdistricts, school locations are scattered. Thus the task of the rural Peniliks is harder than that of their urban colleagues -- some Peniliks have to travel 10 to 20 Kms. on foot to reach the schools.

Regarding administrative matters, such as salary and promotion, the monitoring of teachers and headmasters is conducted by the local government educational unit (Dinas P dan K).

This "dual" supervisory mechanism creates problems. Conflict between MOEC staff and the Local Government Staff (Dinas) has emerged in almost all provinces.

In JS schools the supervision and monitoring of teachers and headmasters is carried out by secondary school supervisors (Pengawas). Pengawas are MOEC personnel based in the capital of the Provinces. The number of Pengawas in each province varies from one to three. Public and private SMTPs are monitored and supervised by different units. The number of Pengawas in a province is inadequate to provide effective supervision. The Pengawas are also based too far from the schools. A Pengawas has to travel between 1 and 200 Kms., or between 15 minutes and a week to reach a school.

4.5 Primary School Statistics

According to the 1985/1986 MOEC School Statistics there are:

139,511 primary schools,
26,550,915 students,
1,037,174 teachers,
3,045 administrative personnel, and
90,231 school janitors.

Seven percent of the schools are private schools. Seven-point-two percent of all teachers and students in Indonesia are in these schools.

Primary school ratios in 1985/1986, based on national data were as follows:

Teacher-student ratio; 1:26 (range 20-39),

Class-student ratio; 1:30 (range 21-38),
School-student ratio; 1:190 (range 111-305), and
Classrooms-school ratio; 1:6.4.

The number of graduates was 12.4% of the total number of students, or 94% of the total Grade VI students.

Classes were held as follows:

91% during the morning,
2% in the afternoon, and
7% in double shifts (morning and afternoon).

Most of the primary school teachers (94.4%) have a preservice training background and a required qualification to be a primary school teacher, the remaining 4.3% have a higher preservice training background. The majority (88.2%) of teachers in public primary schools are civil servants.

4.6 Junior Secondary School (SMTP) Statistics

Table 1

Junior Secondary School Statistics in 1985/1986

Type of School	School	Teacher	Non-Teacher	Students
General JSS (SMP)	6,503	331,529	65,018	5,574,769
Technical JSS (ST)	255	6,270	2,660	80,485
Home Economics JSS (SKKP)	102	1,585	3,474	14,712
Total	16,860	339,387	68,152	5,669,966

Junior Secondary school ratios in 1985/1986, based on national data were as follows:

teacher-student ratio; 1:20 (public), 1:17 (private), and
school-student ratio; 1:508 (public), 1:237 (private).

Based on the above data, if the school-student ratio remains at 500 (public JSS ratio), then in 1993, 13,620 schools will be required. If the school-student ratio is 338 (average public and private JSS ratio) there will be 20,147 JS schools required in 1993.

If the teacher-student ratio is 20 (public JSS Ratio) then there will be 347,000 teachers needed in 1993, but if the ratio is 17 (national average), 408,000 teachers will be needed in 1993. Currently there is enough space in JS schools to accommodate all primary school graduates in 1993 if the private school-student ratio is enlarged to 500. However, since there are many sparsely populated villages in the remote areas, the most realistic school student ratio is about 338. If so, the number of additional schools required will be 3,809. If the teacher-student ratio remains at 1:20, a further 16,471 additional teachers will be needed, or 2,353 teachers per year. If the teacher-students ratio reduced to 1:17, then the number of teachers required will be 76,710 teachers, or 10,900 teachers per year.

5.0 EDUCATION FACILITIES

Government attempts both to expand access and to increase the quality of education have been continuing and have, to date, produced admirable results. Efforts have been made to optimize the utilization of education inputs such as personnel, funds and facilities.

In the framework of the Strengthening Local Education Capacity study and in regard to the critical role of educational facilities, an attempt has been made to gather information about existing PS and JS school facilities.

5.1 Definitions and Specifications

"Prasarana" of primary schools are a set of basic facilities for the education process. They are specified in "The Hand Book of School Equipment Standardization," developed by the Education Equipment Standardization Project, MOEC, 1976.

"Sarana" of primary schools, as stated in the handbook, are a set of instruments and or materials that are directly or indirectly used in the education process. The types of equipment and materials used are determined by the objectives to be attained and the methods employed by the school and its teachers.

5.2 Description of Primary School Sarana and Prasarana

5.2.1 Types of Primary Education

Primary education in Indonesia is carried out by government and the community (private). Act No. 4, 1950, states the basic principles of in-school education and teaching in Indonesia.

Within the context of assisting compulsory education, government has launched various programs and activities to expand primary education opportunities. Primary education is delivered through various channels including the conventional PS (Regular PS and Madrasah Ibtidaiyah). The establishment of "Pamong" PS model, "Small" PS model and "Kejar Paket A" Programs model are manifestations of that policy.

Pamong PS is a model of primary education conducted by the community, parents and teachers with modularized textbooks. Small PS is a primary school carried out using Pamong Model, and is specifically designed for schools in remote rural areas that have less than 60 students and two teachers. Kejar Paket A Program is a nonformal model of primary education, designed for primary school dropout students.

5.2.1.1 Pamong Primary School

Pamong PS can be traced to MOEC Decree No. 041/P/1976, that addresses the implementation of the experiment of a Learning Center for 'PAMONG.' There are no dictated classroom arrangements as participants have the right to decide their own teaching arrangements. They may, for example, be in local residents' homes. In the Pamong PS model, some subject matter is modularized (including Indonesian, Pancasila Moral Education, Science, Social Science, and Math), while the other subjects are delivered through a more conventional approach by the teachers. The modularized materials are designed to be self instructional materials, requiring little assistance from teachers. However, the actual arrangement and provision of facilities at Pamong PS depends on the social, economic, and geographic background of the local community.

5.2.1.2 "Small" Primary School

The main characteristics that differentiate Small PS from conventional PS are the number of enrolled students and the use of the Pamong PS model. In the a conventional PS, the number of students in each grade is relatively large and is fairly constant across grades in a given school. In the Small PS the number of students per grade often varies considerably and is in total less than 60. Other factors that would influence the establishment of a Small PS in an area are a lack of transportation facilities, difficulties in establishing conventional school buildings (lack of funds to build the six classroom type of school buildings), and the absence of qualified teachers prepared to work in remote rural areas.

Self-instructional materials based on the regular PS curriculum presented in the form of "Package Books" are distributed to the Small schools. The MOEC regulations concerning the Small SD state that the Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education of MOEC has the responsibility to provide facilities for Small PS.

As one would expect, the greatest demand for Small PS originates in sparsely populated and remote areas.

5.2.1.3 Kejar Paket A Program

Kejar Paket A program differs considerably from the Pamong and Small PS models, in that it is designed to serve the illiterate 7-44 age group in the communities. Kejar Paket A concentrates on basic skills training. Within the context of the compulsory education program this program may take place in a school building, community hall or local residence. (See Technical Guidance of Kejar Paket A and Kejar Usaha programs issued by the Directorate of Community Education, MOEC, 1987.)

5.2.1.4 School for Disabled Children

These schools are for children aged 7-12 and are operated under MOEC Decree No. 0222/0/1979. This decree regulates an integrated special education for disabled children in regular PS. SLBs are established in each district. According to its curricula, an SLB consists of a class for blind children, a class for deaf children, and a class of physically retarded children.

5.2.2 Schools, Classrooms and Materials

5.2.2.1 Supply

The construction of PS buildings/classrooms is is the responsibility of both central and local government. Funds are allocated in annual budgets for financing SD construction. In addition, a number of SD are constructed by communities (non-government agencies) individuals, organizations, and social institutions.

Since Repelita II (1974/1975) the provision of primary school buildings and classrooms has included the supply of basic equipment (implemented through the SD-Inpres). The first Presidential Instruction (No. 10, 1973) concerned the provision of direct aid to local districts, a program targeted at the universalization of PS for children in the 7-12 age group which was designed to reduce the financial burden of the community regarding the cost of primary education.

The actual responsibility for the execution of Inpres and the construction of PS buildings was operationally delegated to local government. At that level, project leaders and treasurers were recruited from the Provincial office of MOEC.

Operational guidance on the implementation of financial aid for PS establishment and rehabilitation is determined by the MHA instruction No. 18, 1984, which provides guidance on the implementation of SD establishment and rehabilitation. MHA instruction No. 18, 1985, determined the number of schools (SD, MI, and Private SD) and complimentary equipment/facilities for each district in the 27 provinces. The funds allocated for the SD aid program in 1985/1986 were Rp 617,002,000,000.00.

Since it was launched in 1974/1975, SD Inpres has provided 386,047 classrooms; i.e., approximately one-half of existing (785,817) classrooms in public and private SDs.

Local government bears the responsibility of providing 1,500 square meters of land for each school to be constructed.

5.2.2.2 Description of School Classrooms (Primary School)

There are two basic types of school building, either 3 classrooms or the 6 classrooms (leveled). SDs can be categorized according to their enrollment, as follows:

- Type A: enrollment of 12 classes of students with 40 students/class or 400 students/school, with a minimum of 361 students/school.

- Type B: enrollment of 6 to 9 classes of students, 40 students/class with a maximum of 360 students/school and a minimum of 181 students/school.
- Type C: enrollment of 6 classes with a maximum of 80 students/school and a minimum of 91 students/school.
- Type D: enrollment of 6 classes with a maximum of 90 students/school and a minimum of 60 students/school.
- Type E (Small School): enrollment of less than 60 students.

The minimum number of students of type A, B, and C is a fixed requirement to establish the respective type school. Type D is primarily established in sparsely populated areas.

There are 139,511 conventional SD in the 27 provinces. These schools consists of 129,500 public SD (92.83%) and 10,007 private SD (7.17%). These SDs (139,511) have 893,018 classrooms. An average of 6.4 classrooms/school.

Of the public SDs (129,504), 70,918 (54.76%) schools were established through the SD-Inpres program, while the remainder (58,586) were established through regular procedures. The funds for SD-Inpres are allocated in the central government budget, while the funds for the regular SDs are allocated in local government budgets (at the Provincial and District levels).

Table 2

Number of SD by Status in Indonesia 1985/1986

Status	Total	Percentage
1. Regular Public SD	58,586	42.00
2. SD Inpres	70,918	50.83
3. Private SD	10,007	7.17
Grand Total	139,511	100.00

Source: School Statistics, 1985/1986, Balitbang Dikbud, MOEC.

The 1985/1986 school statistics indicate that the largest number of SDs in the 27 provinces are found in West Java. This province has 23,610 SDs (public and private). On the other hand, East Timor has the smallest number of SDs, 474.

Of the 893,018 classrooms, 829,038 are in public schools, and 68,980 in private schools. Not all the classrooms belong to the schools. There are 111,201 (12.5%) classrooms that are either borrowed, rented or shared with other schools.

Table 3

Number of Classrooms by Type of School and Ownership 1985/1986

School by Status	Ownership					
	School Property		Not Sch. Property		Total	Percent
Reg. Public SD	44,272	43.81	72,98	65.62	416,256	46.35
Inpres Public SD	386,047	49.13	26,732	24.07	412,779	45.97
Private SD	55,498	7.06	13,482	10.31	68,980	7.68
Grand Total	785,819	100.00	111,201	100.00	898,018	100.00

Source: School Statistic, 1985/1986, Balitbang Dikbud, MOEC.

About one-third of the classrooms are in need of repair. Of the existing 785,817 owned classrooms, only 492,870 (62,73%) are in good condition. Of the remainder, it is estimated that 93,000 are in need of extensive repair.

The 1985/1986 School Statistics reveal that the 893,018 classrooms utilized for SD served 26,550,915 students; an average classroom-student ratio of 1:30.

5.2.2.3 Books and Equipment

Since the beginning of the Pelita programs there have been two distribution channels for textbooks and school equipment. The supply of textbooks is the responsibility of the MOEC local units that work in cooperation with community and private agencies in the processes of production and distribution of texts to all regions and schools. Since the First Pelita the supply of almost all textbooks has been increased as a result of development projects. Books are also supplied as part of the SD-Inpres program.

Textbook and equipment supply, especially through private agencies and textbook projects is strictly monitored. Presidential Decrees No. MA/1980 and 18/1981 cover all aspects of office facilities (including education equipment) supplied by government. The decrees address the administrative, technical, social and political aspects of facilities provision, and within MOEC are complemented by Ministerial Instruction No. 2/M/1983 which is designed to control the supply of education equipment and facilities. Within the framework of UPE, MOEC has distributed free books to students throughout the country. For this purpose central government approved 14 projects within MOEC.

Operationally, the books may be supplied through the purchasing of texts, self-publishing, grants/gifts, and textbook exchange. Central government supplied books and teaching learning aids include:

- Package Books (and/or Modules) for Pancasila, mathematics, science, grades I through VI, and
- Learning kits/aids for Pancasila, moral education, science, social science, Indonesian language, skills training, arts, and sports.

In order to meet MOEC pedagogical, methodological and curriculum requirements, all texts and aids are to be approved by MOEC or subordinate units (Secretary General/Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education; Bureau of Education Facilities of MOEC) or the Special Executive Team.

Within MOEC there is an organized task force for education equipment standardization. The task force has an evaluation team to the review books and equipment supplied by private agencies. The evaluation of books primarily focuses on the relevancy and quality of the book. After books have been approved by MOEC they are distributed to the regions by private agencies.

5.2.3 Junior Secondary School (SMTP)

At the JSS level the supply of buildings and equipment is the responsibility of MOEC provincial offices and subordinate units. These offices are responsible for the provision of new buildings and buying and renting buildings and equipment.

The Hand Book of Standardized School Equipment issued by the Education Equipment Standardization Project, MOEC, 1976, specifies four types of JSS Space Arrangement Plans: A, B, C, and D. Basically, each type has 3 grades: grade I, II and III. The capacity of each grade is specified as follows:

- Type A, maximum enrollment capacity is 30 classes with 40 students/class, with a minimum of 1,200 and a maximum of 1,400 students.
- Type B, maximum enrollment capacity is 23 classes with 40 students/class, with a minimum of 800 and a maximum of 900 students.
- Type C, maximum enrollment capacity is 12 classes with 40 students/class, with a minimum of 400 and a maximum of 480 students.
- Type D, maximum enrollment capacity is 7 classes with 40 students/class, with a minimum of 250 and a maximum of 280 students.

In 1985/1986 there were 16,503 SMTP in the 27 provinces of Indonesia (see SMTP statistics issued by Pusinfot Balitbang Dikbud). Most of these (62.82%) are private schools. These schools housed 132,590 classes, of which 59,954 were in private SMTPs. The average number of classes per school was 8.03, and each class had an average of 42.05 students.

To accommodate those classes there were 98,370 classrooms, of which 57,022 classrooms were in public SMTPs. Each JSS has on average 5.96 classrooms. These figures illustrate the shortage of classroom space that exists at the SMTP level. To overcome the problems caused by a classroom shortage, schools usually rent and/or teach in double shifts in the available classrooms. In addition to the regular/conventional type of SMTP (conducted on a school campus), the Government of Indonesia also operated a pilot school, namely "SMP Terbuka" (Open SMTP).

5.2.3.1 SMP Terbuka

SMP Terbuka was designed to overcome the problems of inadequacy of SMTP facilities and teachers, especially in remote rural areas. The legal foundation of the SMP Terbuka is the MOEC Decree No. 034/U/1979. Most teaching in this type of JSS is conducted out of the school building, and the learning materials are delivered through various media (radio, cassettes and papers). Through the implementation of SMP Terbuka, it is expected that JSS enrollment can be expanded, and that government expenditures for school buildings reduced.

5.3 Problems

1. An evaluation of Primary Schools by LP3ES (UI) revealed that there was inefficient and ineffective use of education facilities supplied from PS Development programs (SD-Inpres). For example, the incorrect selection of PS locations resulted in an underutilization of new classrooms.

   SD-Inpres fund has no allocation for land purchases; it is the responsibility of local governments to supply land for PS. In practice it is very difficult acquire land especially in urban areas as the price is so high. For this reason, there have been a number of discrepancies between the planned and actual SD-Inpres location, causing in many cases a school to be underutilized. The problem is further exacerbated by an existing regulation that SD-Inpres should be completely constructed within a given fiscal year. In reality, as one year is not an adequate time period to construct a school building, new school buildings have been of poor quality and often badly located.

2. There are constraints on distribution of books and equipment especially to the remote schools in rural areas and on the small outer islands. Communication is particularly difficult in certain seasons. To overcome this problem, the allocation of additional resources, funds and personnel, is required.

3. There are many unused laboratory instruments that were supplied through development aid programs. This was the result of either the teachers being ill-prepared to use the equipment, or the school being unwilling to use the equipment as they were afraid to break it.

4. Community contributions to assist in the supply of educational facilities are decreasing due to a strong belief that primary education is fully the responsibility of government. The decreasing participation of community on this matter has been, in part, a result of the SD-Inpres program.

   However, in several provinces the contracts for SD-Inpres were not given to contractors but to community organizations. This strategy invited community participation and enhanced a sense of belonging. And, in some cases, the quality of school buildings were far above the ones built by contractors.

6.0 EDUCATIONAL FINANCE: PRIMARY AND JUNIOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, and the Peoples Assembly Decree No. II/MPR/1983 state that the responsibility for education is shared by the government, the community, and parents; implying that the provision of resources for education can be either a government and/or a community responsibility.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6.1 The Government Budget

The government's share of the costs for education are drawn from two major sources – the National Government Budget and the Local Government Budget.

6.1.1 The National Government Budget (NGB)

NGB allocates funds for financing various programs and activities in the Sector of Education, Youth, National Culture, and Belief in God. Funds allocated under this Sector are distributed through the relevant Ministries. In the case of primary and junior secondary schools, funds are distributed through the MOEC, MOHA, and MORA.

The NGB consists of two kinds of budget, the "Recurrent Budget" and the "Development Budget." The allocation of funds for financing education in either part of the budget is not based on a fixed ratio. Consequently, the amount of funding for education changes from year to year in line with the priorities set by national development programs.

MOEC, MOHA, and MORA distribute allocated funds to their subordinate units. MOEC distributes the available funds (both for primary and junior secondary schools) through the Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education, Provincial Offices of MOEC, District and Subdistrict Offices of MOEC. The funds for primary education that are managed by MOEC are allocated for financing the expenditures for the various technical aspects of education, such as curriculum development, teacher training and textbooks.

MOHA funds for financing primary schools include the National Government Subsidy for Financing Public Primary Schools Operation (SBPP-SD). This fund is distributed to schools and school supervisors by MOHA through its Provincial Government Education Division at the provincial and district levels.

The recurrent budget is used for financing the routine expenditures while development budget is used for financing the educational projects of the current Repelita. Development funds are not available every year.

Government revenues, as indicated in the government financial memorandum and the NGB for the year 1987/1988, consisted of:

- Domestic revenues
  1) Revenue from crude oil and liquid natural gas.
  2) Revenue from sources other than oil and natural gas:
     a) Income tax
     b) Added value tax on goods and services and the sales tax on luxury goods
     c) Import and export duties, and excise taxes
     d) Land and building holding taxes
     e) Miscellaneous other taxes
     f) Non-tax revenues

- Development revenues:
  1) Program aid.
  2) Project aid.

The expenditure categories of the government budget are:

- Recurrent expenditure:
  1) Personnel expenditures:
     a) Rice subsidy
     b) Salaries and pension
     c) Allowances
     d) Miscellaneous personnel expenditures
     e) Overseas personnel expenditures
  2) Material expenditures:
     a) Domestic material expenditures
     b) Overseas material expenditures
  3) Subsidies for regional autonomy:
     a) Personnel expenditures
     b) Non-personnel expenditures
  4) Interests and installment payment of:
     a) Domestic debt
     b) Foreign debt
  5) Miscellaneous routine expenditures.
- Development expenditures:
  1) Domestic exchange values expenditures (Nota Keuangan dan RAPBN: 1987/1988):
     a) Ministries and other government institutions:
        – Ministries and other government institutions
        – Ministry of Defense
     b) Subsidy for regional governments:
        – Subsidy for village development
        – Subsidy for District development
        – Subsidy for Province development
        – Subsidy for Primary School establishment
        – Subsidy for health services and community health centers development
        – Subsidy for 'market' development
        – Subsidy for 'green movement'
        – Subsidy for land transportation facilities
        – Subsidy for East Timor Province
        – Regional financing using fund earnings from land and building holding taxes (PBB)
     c) Miscellaneous other financing items:
        – Fertilizer subsidy
        – Government capital share/participation
        – Others

2) Project Aids:

a) Foreign exchange values
b) Domestic exchange values

Development funds are used to supply equipment and other facilities including establishing school buildings, official/formal housing, and other items.

The government subsidy for financing public primary schools operation (SBPP-SDN) is arranged fiscal year by MOEC, MHA and MOF. These Ministries issue annual memoranda of understanding (No. 31, 1984, No. 0209a/K/1984, and No. 379a/KMK.011/1984), re: the management of subsidies for financing public schools operations. Ministers of Education and Culture and Minister of Finance are involved in managing the subsidy because each has a significant and relevant role. The Ministry of Education and Culture manages the technical aspects of education for primary schools, while the Ministry of Finance functions as/manages the financial aspect.

Items to be financed by subsidy fund include:

- The in-school education process
- School administration
- School maintenance
- School personnel welfare
- School sports and art exhibitions
- Student Report Books (records of student achievement)
- Final examination and reproduction of certificates
- Supervision
- Organizing, managing and reporting activities
- Data Collection

Each of the items listed detailed and fixed specification; there is little flexibility regarding the use of allocated funds. The flow of distributions of the subsidy has been centrally arranged as follows:

All SBPP SD funds are distributed to Provincial Divisions of MOEC and then to its District Divisions. From the District Division, funds for certain line items are delivered to the school's headmasters.

From these specific arrangements it can be seen that there are four levels of implementation: school, subdistrict, district, and provincial.

6.1.2 The Provincial and District Government Budget

Many of the items financed by the NGB are also supported by funds drawn from Local Government Budget. This is in line with Act No. 5, 1974, and Government Regulation No. 65, 1951, concerning the delegation of some aspects of primary school management to local government.

In the category of LGB, there are also funds allocated to finance junior secondary schools. However, this amount is small, as these schools are under the direct management of MOEC, as required by Presidential Decree No. 34, 1972. Local government funds allocated to finance Junior Secondary Schools are distributed to the schools through the Provincial Offices of MOEC.

LGB revenues consist of routine revenues and development revenues.

- Routine Revenues:
  1) Previous year's budget surplus
  2) National government subsidies
  3) Local revenues: taxes, retributions, earnings, security charges, etc.
  4) Cash and account divisions
- Development Revenues:
  1) Subsidies for regional development
  2) Land and building holding taxes
  3) Revenues from SWRPJ (transportation taxes)
  4) Local government enterprises earnings
  5) Miscellaneous local revenues
  6) Loans and credits
  7) Cash and account divisions

The expenditures of local government consist of routine and development expenditures.

- Routine Expenditures:
  1) Personnel expenditures
  2) Material expenditures
  3) Maintenance expenditures
  4) Travel expenditures
  5) Miscellaneous others expenditures
  6) Cash and account division
- Development Expenditures: consists of 18 sectors, including the sector of Education, Youth, National Culture, and Belief in God.

Tied to the subsidy received from the NGB (in this case MOHA) are guidelines concerning regional development; for example, the following decrees were issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs:

- MHA Decree No. 2, 1982, concerning village duties. This decree in principle allows the village to charge villagers (in the forms of money or materials) in order to improve village government operation and to fund village development programs.
- MHA Decree No. 9, 1983, concerning guidance on identifying resources and prospects for development. This decree is concerned with the encouragement of exploration, data collection on resources and potential development projects. This data may be used by all government agencies both sectoral and local at either central or regional levels as well as by the community.

- MHA Decree No. 58, 1983, concerning the Advisory Committee on the Subsidies and Funding of Autonomous Regions. This committee has among other duties, to formulate guidelines for planning subsidies and aid to balance the autonomous regional budgets. Thus affecting the allocation of subsidies and aid to local governments.

These regulations demonstrate the strong influence that central government still has. However, if that influence is well managed and implemented, it will provide for regional development, including the further development of primary and junior secondary education.

6.2 Community Contribution

Funds raised from community sources come from donations from the business community, Foundations, or individual community members. Community contributions may be in the form of financial aid, materials and facilities support, the building of classrooms and facilities or skill training. A number of businesses and social organizations provide scholarships. Community members also contribute education funds individually or collectively. Individual contributions are, in most cases submitted directly to the school or institution.

Within the framework of encouraging community support to education there is a "Guardian Movement" (Orang Tua Asuh). Orang Tua Asuh is a group of community members who contribute money or school equipment to aid disadvantaged students to enable them enroll and attend primary education institutions (SD and MI). This movement was launched within the context of UPE. The regulations and guidelines for Orang Tua Asuh are stated in the memoranda of understanding Nos. 0318/P/1984, 43/HUK/KEP/VII/1984, and 45/1984, issued by the MOEC, MRA, MSA and MHA. These memoranda are not only concerned with compulsory education, but also with encouraging community involvement in other educational programs, including the provision of aid to disadvantaged students, disabled children, and remote rural children. The organization focuses on the following:

- Aid for disadvantaged students is provided in the form of educational equipment, school uniforms, and textbooks.
- Aid for disabled children is provided in the form of education facilities including dormitories and transportation.
- Aid for remote rural children is provided in the form of educational equipment and/or school uniforms.

This aid is provided to the students by the "guardian" through either authorized agencies (i.e., school headmaster, the Head of the Compulsory Education Task Force (Wajar)) charity organizations authorized by Minister of Social Affairs, or (on occasion) directly to the individual students. Since this aid is designed to support the implementation of UPE, it is limited to children from ages 7-12.

6.3 Parental Contribution

Parents and relatives contribute to meeting education costs by paying tuition fees (more recently known as SPP). SPP is paid monthly by parents, and the amount payable is readjusted each year. The development of SPP in PS and JSS was as follows.

6.3.1 SPP in Public Primary Schools

MHA Decree No. 132, 1971, specifies points that should be taken into account concerning SPP:

a. Contribution for public primary school operation is charged to the parents based on categorical standards with respect to:

   1) parents or aid payers' economic capacity
   2) the number of dependent children
   3) level of regional development, particularly economic development

b. That provincial governors arrange the allocation of available funds for public primary school operation by considering the following distribution criteria:

   1) 40% is allocated for teachers/personnel and headmaster welfare
   2) 40% is allocated for school maintenance, equipment and facilities
   3) 10% is allocated for school administrative costs, health care expenditures, library costs, etc.
   4) 10% is allocated for improving the capacities and activities of local MOEC offices and provincial offices of Education and Culture (Dinas).

c. MOEC, MHA and MOF issued memoranda of understanding Nos. 0257/K/1974, 221/1974, and KEP.1606/MK/1/11/1974, concerning a rearrangement of the guidelines; re: contributions for public primary school operation. Essentially, these memoranda represent merging decrees issued by individual Ministers of Education and Home Affairs, with little change in content. Recently, the burden of the parents in public primary school to pay the SPP has been abolished and has been replaced by the central government subsidy for public primary school operation (see discussion of government subsidy SBPP-SD).

6.3.2 SPP in Junior Secondary School

a. MOEC Decree No. 099, 1971, concerning arrangements (re: SPP for school operation, fellowships and scholarships) states that the SPP for school operation should be charged according to:

   1) the type and level of education,
   2) the geographical setting of the schools, and
   3) the financial ability of the parents or payers.

b. A follow-up MOEC Decree No. 0192, 1971, concerning the collection, implementation, and control of SPP dictates that SPP be based on categorical standards of:

   1) the financial capacity of the parents or payers,
   2) the number of dependents of the parents or payers,
   3) type and level of education, and
   4) regional development level.

The financial capacity of parents is assessed through a review of information provided by their village head concerning their socioeconomic status. The level of regional development level is assessed by the MHA.

c. Allocation of the SPP for school operations to individual programs and activities is based on standardized percentages:

  1) 40% for teacher and administrative personnel incentives
  2) 5% for teaching-learning process
  3) 20% for development programs
  4) 5% for supervision
  5) 10% for equalizing the school's status of development (particularly applicable to schools under the management of the provincial offices of MOEC).

d. In addition to the decrees mentioned above, MOEC issued a set of decrees concerning special treatment for economically disadvantaged students:

  1) Decree No. 0115/K/1973, re: the waiving of SPP fees for children of disabled veterans
  2) Decree No. 0191/K/1973, re: the waiving of SPP fees for the children of National Independency Heroes, Revolution Heroes, and Pioneers of the Independence Movement
  3) Decree No. 0192/K/1973, re: the waiving of SPP fees for students who live as wards of a guardian or charity. These decrees specify, among other things, the required conditions that should be met to gain either special treatment or a fee waiver.

e. The arrangement of SPP for JSS operation (still in effect) was detailed in memoranda of understanding issued by MOEC and MOF Nos. 0622/K/1986 and 806/KMK/03/1986. These memoranda regulate the National Government Subsidy for secondary school operation particularly concerning the following:

  1) That SPP cannot be directly utilized by schools, it should be deposited to Bank Rakyat Indonesia (BRI) to a MOEC account
  2) That central government allocates funds from the NGB for education programs (DPP) that will be submitted to the schools in place of the SPP funds that are banked. The amount of the subsidy allocated is the equivalent of the SPP amount that should be collected for each fiscal year.
  3) That DPP (SPP equivalent) be used for the following:
    a) The teaching learning process
    b) Providing the school with needed equipment and facilities
    c) School maintenance
    d) Personnel welfare
    e) Districts and provincial offices of MOEC activities
    f) Students' Report Files
    g) School and National examinations (EBTA/EBTANAS), distribution of school certificates (blanks) from the provincial offices to the district offices of MOEC, issuing certificates and the original national examination test score
    h) Supervision
    i) Management of education at schools, district and provincial levels, and
    j) Data collection.
  4) Distribution of subsidy for education (DPP) to the schools should follow the following procedures.
    a) The central office treasurer of DPP (there are also treasurers at the local and school levels) presents a financial application to the office of Public Treasury, Jakarta III (KPN) that includes a specific plan for implementation.
    b) Based on that application the Office of Public Treasury issues a money order to the authorized Bank (Central of Bank Rakyat Indonesia – BRI) for the distribution of funds to the branches of the bank in the districts.
    c) The branch offices of BRI distribute money to the provincial and districts offices of MOEC and the schools who then use the money according to specific regulations (described earlier).
  5) The amount of SPP paid by students in Junior Secondary Schools is divided into four categories:
    Category I: Rp 1.500 per month
    Category II: Rp 1.000 per month

Category III: Rp 700 per month
Category IV: Rp 450 per month

6) The memorandum of understanding also specifies who has the right for special treatment or a waiver of SPP. (Previously this was specified in a separate document.)

6.3.3 Contributions of Parents Association (BP3)

BP3 exists in every primary and secondary school. The implementation of Joint Instruction, MOEC and MHA Nos. 17/O/1974 and 29/1974, established BP3 at each school. This association is organized under the accepted principle that government, community, and parents share the responsibility of education.

The membership of BP3 consists of parents/guardians and the school students. BP3 has two formal tasks:

1. To provide assistance to the school, but not to intervene in the technical aspects of education which are the legal responsibility of the headmasters, teachers, and respective government agencies.
2. To organize efforts to generate and encourage community contributions either in the form of financial support, material contribution, or service to the schools, without causing undue burden to parents/guardians.

6.4 Educational Financing in Private Schools

In general, private schools, both primary and junior secondary, are managed by nonprofit organizations (religious or non-religious foundations). These schools can be viewed as 'self-financing schools,' in terms of their ability to collect funds to meet the larger part of their financial needs.

Government has not yet regulated the financing of private schools, but have suggested that the owners of these schools not charge too heavy tuition fees. In practice, the owner of the private schools consults the parents/guardians of enrolled students when determining the amount of the school fees that will be charged.

Since 1958, government has provided subsidies to private schools, as specified in the following documents:

- Government Regulation No. 32, 1958, concerning aid to national private schools.

  This regulation deals with the specification of the form of aid, and the required conditions that should be met in order to gain government support.

- Minister of Education Teaching and Culture Decree No. 108466/UU/1960, provides further specification concerning the provision of subsidies to private schools.

  This decree, in essence, functions as a guideline for the implementation of regulation No. 32, 1958. It specifies the category of the subsidy, based on the amount of monies allocated for each school the subsidies are categorized into two types, i.e., "subsidy" and "aid." "Aid" has allocations of ranging from Rp 3 to Rp 40 per student/month; while "subsidy" has allocations ranging from Rp 6 to Rp 80 per student/month. These standards of subsidy are the same for kindergarten through secondary school.

- Minister of Education and Culture Circular No. 33135/Sekj/Depk/1975, dealing with the rearrangement of the unit cost of the subsidy for private schools.

> This circular also specifies additional subsidies for private schools, especially subsidies for materials. The new standard of allocation ranges from Rp 75 to Rp 150 per student/month for all school levels. While "subsidy" for material expenditure ranges from Rp 37,500 to Rp 67,500 per class/year for junior and senior secondary schools.

The IEES Sector Review indicated that the annual costs per student in private SMPs is lower than in public SMPs. In 1985 it was Rp 94,205 and Rp 107,300, respectively. About 28% of total school costs in the private schools are paid from the parents' contributions. This is, on average, higher than the percentage paid by parents of public school students. These figures came from private schools which get Church and/or government aid. In other private schools the proportion paid by parents is even greater. Researchers found that many fully private SMPs with about 250 students are being operated wholly by parents contributions. Their annual costs per student are between Rp 52,000 and Rp 57,000 (in 1987 rupiahs).

The above indicates:

1. That the largest resources for public primary and junior secondary school operation come from government. The community and parents are encouraged to provide contributions. However, the potential of parental contributions has not yet been fully explored.
2. That there are still many central influences on the financial management of local education operation, particularly at the primary and junior secondary school levels. Some of the central government intervention is aimed at the protection of disadvantaged parents and guardians. In many cases the policies of central government are ignored by BP3, in that they do not involve members in determining their policies.
3. That the dual management of primary schools (i.e., between MOEC and MHA) causes systemwide inefficiencies, particularly in the areas of personnel management and educational finance.

7.0 COMMENTARY

The Problems and Prospects of Implementing NBE

From the available data and information some conclusions can be drawn:

Management

In the management of education, the role of central government is generally dominant. The role of local government (Pemda) the community and parents has been secondary.

There is dual management at the SD level, in that technical matters are managed by MOEC, and administrative aspects (i.e., personnel, facilities, and finance) by the MHA. There are also religious schools at the SD and SMPT levels that are administered by the MRA.

Education Curricula

Although some efforts have been made to improve the curricula (e.g., the adoption of the 1984 curriculum, the CBSA delivery approach, etc.) there are still a number of problems in the implementation of these changes, particularly concerning curriculum content, personnel matters, facilities, and funding.

Policies addressing curriculum improvement need to be spelled out in more detail to avoid misinterpretation in their implementation.

Personnel

Education personnel, both in qualitative and quantitative terms have not been adequate. In addition, the processes of recruitment and utilization of personnel has not been done efficiently carried out.

Facilities

Similarly, additional facilities, especially buildings, are needed. There is a need to improve the quality of existing facilities. More efficient utilization of facilities is also necessary.

Funding

The funds for education mostly come from government. Financial support from the community and parents has not been fully explored. The main problems are that there are insufficient funds allocated for education, while those funds allocated are inefficiently used.

Supervision and Monitoring

In the area of supervision and monitoring, certain changes need to be made for the process to become more effective. At the primary level an integrated supervision and monitoring mechanism is needed. At the Junior Secondary level the supervisory tasks need to be the responsibility of the district office.

A supervisory and monitoring unit for both public and private Junior High Schools is recommended.

Generally speaking, it can be said that the resources for education are centrally managed. The role of central government is dominant, while other stakeholders have not been involved to their fullest potential. However, policies have been made that when implemented will affect the educational components mentioned above. The policies are as follows:

- A concept of NBE which in principle includes the three-year SMTP cycle in the Basic Education cycle.
- The implementation of curricula with local content. Here the regions are given the authority to determine a percentage of the content and to organize the curriculum according to local conditions. Included in this policy are matters pertaining to the teaching learning process, and the evaluation of learning outcomes.

A comparison between the existing situation and the policies issued shows discrepancies (gaps) that need to be addressed prior to the implementation of NBE.

1. The availability of education personnel is a major concern, particularly teachers. Each region will need to be more able to calculate their teacher needs for teachers, as well as training and placing them. To date, these concerns have been the responsibility of the central government (MOEC).

   As an illustration, assuming that all SD graduates will be absorbed into SMTP, between 1986/1987 and 1993/1994 Central Java will need an additional 53,164 teachers, an average of 6,645 teachers per year. If the current rate of transfer from SD to SMTP continues estimates are that the province will need only 12,171 new teachers, or an average of 1,739 teachers per year. There is a clearly a large difference, which would have to be addressed by the province. (The estimates above take into account a 2% attrition rate of teachers, due to retirement, etc.)

The Province of Riau will need an average of 936 new SMTP teachers a year from 1986/1987 to 1993/1994, if all SD graduates should be absorbed in SMTP. Continuing the present rate of transfer, there will be a need for 597 new teachers each year. In NTT Province, the average requirement will be for 969 additional teachers per year to implement NBE, compared with 554 new teachers a year to continue the present rate of transfer.

The projected need for additional Junior Secondary School teachers in the three provinces illustrates that unless there is an adjustment to the funding polices that effect the educational budget, it will be extremely difficult to implement a NBE that will absorb all SD graduates in SMTP.

Additional teachers for primary schools will also be required. Some 5,948 additional primary school teachers will be needed in Central Java each year, 1,155 in Riau, and 1,112 in NTT. If the capacity of government to appoint new teachers is only 7,000 a year, the government could then only appoint new primary school teachers for two provinces.

The increase in the need for new teachers for both SD and SMTP will affect the organization and the mechanism of preparing, appointing, and placing teachers. Careful consideration needs to be paid to the capacity of Teacher Training Institutions (LPTK) and the capacity of government to appoint new teachers as government employees. In order that the supply of teachers could be secured, this researcher suggests that a program of regional teacher preparation should be encouraged, and the procedures and mechanism of their appointment, once trained, simplified. In addition it is thought that models for the projecting additional teacher and classroom requirements be developed in district level.

Currently, the closed teacher career structure has a negative effect; teachers with a higher education background move to secondary schools in order to further their careers. A new scheme which equalizes primary and secondary school teachers in their career development should also be considered as part of the overall NBE plan.

2. The experiences of the last decade of curriculum reform indicate that teacher inservice training is a must. However, the current, centralized inservice training model not only is lengthy, but it is also costly, and in the opinion of this researcher is both ineffective and inefficient.

   PKG inservice teacher training is practiced in the primary schools, and a similar approach is being introduced in secondary schools. This could become an effective scheme in implementing local content curriculum, and as such should be encouraged. The PKG mechanism could also integrate a development of local content curriculum, and a unit of school planning.

3. The projections of the number of new classrooms needed to accommodate all SD graduates by 1993/1994 present quite a challenge to school planners: In Central Java for example, 23,846 additional classrooms will be needed, i.e., 2,650 per year. In Riau, 329, and in NTT 340 a year, this is estimated on the basis of 50, 53, and 53 students per classroom respectively. If the projections were based on current rates of transfer between levels, Central Java, Riau, and NTT would need 1,095, 233, and 236 new classrooms per year respectively. If the ratio of students per classroom is lowered down to regulation 40, then the number of additional classrooms required increases dramatically.

   In order to minimize the cost of new teachers and classrooms, alternative methods of using available resources (manpower, money and materials) need to be identified, tested and adopted accordingly. Attaching SMP and SD schools, employing double and/or overlapping shifts are some alternatives. To increase access to SMP for the students in remote places other types of schooling should be developed; boarding schools, distance teaching by radio/tv, and the small school model using modularized materials are examples of these alternatives.

A new scheme for providing textbooks and learning materials needs to be developed for local areas. Therefore strengthening local capacity in education could include the support of local materials development and distributors. Such a mechanism could be used to assist in the implementation of the local content curriculum policy.

4. Solving the problems associated with the needs outlined above will depend on the capacity of government, parents and the community to fund and support NBE. The capacity of the central government to support system growth has decreased in recent years. However, this does not mean that the education expenditure for basic education could not be increased: If basic education is regarded as the key element in Indonesian education, that in turn develops the capabilities of Indonesian citizens to increase their participation in national development, a structure of priority policies could be formulated to focus the necessary resources on basic education.

   The removal of such obstacles as the unnecessary duplication of management and curriculum would release much needed resources. For example, the delegation of the management of SD to district and sub-district levels will certainly reduce costs, and will, it is expected, impact on the currently low morale of educators.

   On the part of local government there appears to be more options to increase participation in funding. For example, some portion of PBB (land and building tax) could be appropriated in a more concrete way.

   On the part of parents, it will be difficult to increase their contributions in monetary terms unless changes are made in the school management system that will allow parents a sense of belonging and some degree of ownership and consequent responsibility for the school.

   At the primary school level, the SD Inpres scheme (the central government builds the schools) had a negative impact on parents' and communities emotional and actual attachment to the schools. This was determined mostly because they did not participate in the construction of the schools. The SPP (parents contribution fees in SMTP), and BP3 fund-raising (in both SD and SMTP) are the main methods of getting financial contributions from parents. These two schemes could also be redesigned so that the more wealthy parents could contribute more. For lower SES parents the universalization of JSS would become a burden, therefore a scheme to alleviate their additional costs may have to be developed.

   At the community level (local neighborhood, village organization, social and/or business organizations and foundations) there are still a large number of options remaining to gain financial and material support for education. Probably if the community is given more responsibility and rights in the planning, costing and organization of basic education, their participation could be further strengthened.

   The greater part of educational costs are incurred in the recurrent budget; salaries, maintenance and equipment. The building and provision of schools by government to private organizations, that then assume their recurrent costs, is one option that must be considered.

5. The policy of a national curriculum with 20% local content implies a decentralization of some part of curriculum development authority to local MOEC units, local government, parents, and the community. These entities need to be strengthened in respect to their ability to develop curriculum. Schools as individual units or as a group will become the most important local units in implementing a element of local content in the curriculum. The strengthening of local capabilities in this area could be started at the school level in collaboration with concerned elements of the community.

6. Although it is already clear that the MOEC is for the time being continuing with a policy of separate management of SD and SMTP, there are related problems that will be encountered in universalizing NBE. For example, in remote areas and in those areas where it is difficult to construct new buildings, there is little option but to use the SD building, and physically attaching the SMTP to the SD. It appears that the management of SD and the SMTP will in the long run need to be integrated; as will the management of parental and community involvement. Perhaps one

approach that government can take to facilitate these developments will be the development of a new scheme similar to PAMONG (education by parents, community, and teachers).

The illustrations of the status of SD and SMTP described above indicate many issues, problems and concerns that will need to be addressed in the planning and implementation of NBE. (See Table 4, Summary of Problems and Prospects of SD and SMTP.) The main policy question for further study are summarized as:

> "In considering the problems and prospects of NBE, what operational policies should be considered to increase parents' and community support so that NBE can be fully implemented by 1994/1995?"

This policy question could be addressed as follows:

- Considering the current availability of personnel, materials, and funding, should NBE be implemented nationwide, or could it be better introduced in stages according to the supportive capacity of local MOEC offices, communities and existing facilities?
- What are the options for the management of NBE?
- How can the necessary facilities for universal NBE be most efficiently provided?
- How the preparation and the appointment of new teachers be most efficiently made?
- How can an increase in parental, and community participation be encouraged in such a manner that it will provide lasting support to the implementation of NBE?

To answer these questions, a study which includes an action research approach seems appropriate. Baseline data and secondary information could be collected from the parents, communities, local government offices and organizations, and utilized to develop a model (or models) for implementing NBE in district catchment areas.

From the first phase of the SLEC study, several recommendations are offered for consideration. They are:

1. The planning capability of local units should be increased as early as possible.
2. As overall enrollments are expected to grow dramatically, the preparation of teachers should be started as soon as possible. Otherwise "emergency" training and recruitment of teachers will become the only method of meeting teacher demand, and this may further impair the quality of education.
3. New options for financing education which permit and encourage schools and communities to raise additional and/or recurrent funds need to be identified.
4. To successfully implement NBE by 1994, private schools need to be fostered and strengthened. New policies and regulations to permit their monitored growth will need to be tabled. These could include regulations that:
    a. provide private schools with a catchment area in order that they can get enough students to continue as viable educational enterprises;
    b. give small and financially weak private schools a subsidy that will permit their continuation as viable educational enterprises; and

    c. provide equal rights and responsibilities to the parents of children in public and private schools.

5. To assist in planning and supervisory activities, the appointment of Junior Secondary School Pengawas at the district level is necessary.

Bibliography

Balitbang Dikbud, *Naskah Akademik Bahan Rancangan Peraturan Pemerintah Tentang Tenaga Kependidikan*. (Policy paper for formulating Government regulation concerning Educational Personnel.) Jakarta: Balitbang Dikbud, 1985.

------, *Policy Study: A Guide to Medium Term Manpower Planning for the Ministry of Education and Culture*. Volume III and IV. Jakarta: Balibang Dikbud, 1987.

------, *School Statistics Summary, Ministry of Education and Culture, 1985/1986*. Jakarta: Balitbang Dikbud, 1987.

Bray, Mark, "Education and Decentralizing in Less Developing Countries: A Comment on General Trends, Issues and Problems, with Particular Reference to Papua New Guinea," *Comparative Education*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 1985.

Cheema, S.G., and Rondinelli, D.A., "Implementing Decentralization Policies," in Cheema and Rondinelli, *Decentralization and Development*. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1982.

Rondinelli, D.A., "*Overview of Decentralization in Developing Counties.*" Brief Notes for USAID Workshop on Decentralization of Education Services. Washington, D.C., 1986.

Majchrzak, Ann, *Methods for Policy Research*. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1986.

Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems Project

POLICY RESEARCH INITIATIVE
STRENGTHENING LOCAL EDUCATION CAPACITY

INDONESIA

PHASE II RESEARCH REPORT

Dr. Mohammed Romli Suparman
Balitbang Dikbud

November 1989

Table of Contents

Page
1.0 Introduction . . . . A 4–5
2.0 Background Information . . . . A 4–5
3.0 Procedures and Organization . . . . A 4–7
4.0 Findings . . . . A 4–9
5.0 Policy Issues and Recommendations . . . . A 4–22

Attachment: Interview Schedule . . . . A 4–25

List of Tables

1. Sample by District, by Subdistrict, and Role . . . . A 4–10
2. Sample by Sex of Student of Interviewed Parent . . . . A 4–10
3. Parent Sample by Education Level . . . . A 4–11
4. Parent Sample by Occupation of Father . . . . A 4–11
5. Parent Sample by Family Size . . . . A 4–12
6. Parent Sample by SES . . . . A 4–12
7. School Fees (SPP + BP3) Paid . . . . A 4–13
8. SPP Fees Paid . . . . A 4–15
9. Parents Education Expenses by Subdistrict (Rp.) . . . . A 4–16
10. Frequency of Participation at School Events, per Year . . . . A 4–16
11. Income and Expenditure of Four Sampled Public SMPs (Rp. 000s) . . . . A 4–17

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This two phase research study was a joint project conducted by Balitbang Dikbud with IEES assistance. Phase I focused on providing a status review of local capacity to support educational activities, particularly the implementation of the GOI policy to introduce a Nine-Year Basic Education (NBE) cycle. In addition, Phase I provided the terms of reference for Phase II, the research component of the study.

While Phase I drew mainly on document analyses and regionally held group discussions, the purpose of Phase II was to determine, from field research, the constraints on, and opportunities for strengthening local education capacity, especially parents' capacity to support the implementation of NBE. The research is regarded as critical by GOI as they are, by necessity, determined to increase the role of parents and community members in school activities. GOI interest focuses on parents' and community members sense of commitment to the school, increasing the professional competence of teachers, headmasters and other education professionals at the school, local and regional levels.

Phase II actually consisted of two research activities, the first, "Study A" was a field survey that focused on the collection of information on factors related to local participation in education, specifically at the primary and junior secondary levels. The second, "Study B" is a Balitbang Dikbud funded action research activity that concentrates on model (or models) development for the planning of district level implementation of NBE. This report refers only to Study A.

This report is primarily a descriptive one that details the analysis of survey data gathered from a series of interviews with parents. Additional information came from interviewing headmasters of sampled schools, parents association (BP3) chairpersons, local community leaders and village heads.

Project staff appreciated the assistance and suggestions provided by Balitbang Dikbud staff, particularly Dr. Bachtair and Dr. Moegiadi, and the guidance of Dr. Jerry Strudwick, of IIR, and Dr. Richard Pelczar of EPP. They also thank the researchers in Riau and Jawa Tengah who helped in data gathering, and last but not least, gratitude is expressed to the administrative staff in the Research Center who assisted in project typing and data processing.

2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The development policy for the education system in Indonesia is based on the philosophy of Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution (Articles 32 and 33), the Broad Outlines of State Policy, and the Principle of Bhineka Tunggal Ika (Unity in Diversity). The Pancasila philosophy provides direction for the formulation of educational objectives, while the 1945 Constitution provides every citizen to have an equal right to education, and obliges the government to set up one national system of education, while further developing the cultures of the Indonesian nation.

The task of educating the nation is entrusted to the Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC), although in practice other ministries are also involved: The Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA) is responsible for religious education, the Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) is responsible for the administrative aspect of primary education level, while the Ministry of Manpower (MOM) has some responsibility for vocational training. The management of education and culture by several ministries together with the varied geographical, social and cultural environments serve on the one hand to aid the development of national resource potential, while on the other as a source of constraint in the process of developing a national education system.

Since the beginning of Repelita I (Five-Year Development Plan) in 1969, various attempts have been made to improve education in terms of quantity as well as quality in order to meet the demands of national development. Reform in curricula, preservice and inservice teacher training, the construction of school buildings, the provision of school facilities, textbooks writing and the drafting of National Education Law have been carried out, but their outcomes did not fully meet MOEC expectations. In addition to various technical problems being experienced in the delivery of educational services, there are problems that lie beyond the immediate reach of MOEC. Partly in response to this situation various education policies were re-evaluated during the Repelita IV planning process. In 1984 and 1985, policies were made that became reference points for educational and cultural development in later years:

1. Considering the outcomes of national development to date, GOI came to the conclusion that it is appropriate to delegate more of its functions and authority in education to its subordinate units at the regional, local and school levels. The government intent provided the basis for the implementation of the local content component of the national curriculum and of EBTANAS (national school exam).
2. A comparative study of student learning achievement among regions (Moegiadi et al., 1976; A. Suryadi 1983), studies on teacher quality (Suparman and Dahliani, 1985; Jiono, 1986), and the analysis of educational development in Indonesia made educators aware of the need to adjust the curriculum and teacher preparation to suit the varied geographical, social, and cultural environment. Therefore MOEC determined that the percentage of local content in the national curriculum for primary and junior secondary schools (SD and SMTP) as well as for senior secondary schools (SMA and SMKTA) would be 20%.
3. Some of the educational innovations carried-out through various pilot projects have shown promising outcomes which can be disseminated nationally. Consequently, MOEC has determined that, among others actions, Student Active Learning (CBSA) and the enhancement of teacher competence through PKG will be implemented throughout Indonesia.
4. In relation to the current Labor Act (setting minimum employment age at 15), the need to enhance the education of the nation to prepare for its industrial take-off, and the enrollment in primary education reaching 97%, GOI has increased the basic education cycle from 6 years to 9 years. NBE will be implemented in stages: by 1994 (the beginning of Repelita VI) at least 85% of SD and MI (Islamic Primary School) graduates are to be accommodated in junior high schools or their combined equivalent.

The new Education Law (Undang-Undang Nomor 2, 1989) provides a basis simplifying the rather complex system of Indonesian education. The law outlines a central education management system for all levels of education within MOEC. However, some functions will be delegated to local units of MOEC, while other ministries and the private sector are still permitted to run schools.

The Strengthening Local Education Capacity study (SLEC) is directed toward identifying methods of enhancing the regional capacity in education, particularly as policies are adapted and adopted in the light of the new education law.

3.0 PROCEDURES AND ORGANIZATION

Sample and Sampling Technique

The study team collected information from various sources in order to obtain a more complete and objective picture of parent and community participation. Those sources included parents, community leaders in villages where schools were situated, headmasters, BP3's chairpersons, and the village heads.

Two provinces were selected, Jawa Tengah and Riau, as sample areas based on their variation; urban/rural, rice field/mountains, coastal/inland, etc. In each province one municipality and two districts (one close to the capital province) were selected employing a stratified random sampling technique. Two subdistricts were also chosen randomly from each district. In total, 12 subdistricts were drawn from 6 districts in 2 provinces.

From each subdistrict 5 to 6 schools (consisting of 2 public SMTPs, 2 public SDs, 1 private SMTP, and 1 private Madrasah Ibtidaiyah) were randomly selected. In reality not all subdistricts have the types and number of schools as required – as a result only 70 out of a possible 72 schools were included in the sample (21 public SMPs, 15 private SMTPs, 25 public SDs, and 10 private MIs).

Lastly, twelve pupils (randomly selected), the headmaster and BP3 Chairperson were identified for each school. Four social leaders were also chosen randomly from each village where a sampled school was situated. The total sample was as follows: 820 parents, 144 community leader, 59 headmasters, 60 BP3 chairpersons, and 35 village heads.

Development of Research Instruments

To gather data, the following research instruments were developed, field tested in Central Java, and refined for actual field work:

interview schedule for parents and community leaders,
interview schedule for headmasters,
interview schedule for village heads,
interview schedule for BP3 chairpersons, and
forms for collecting secondary data on school characteristics.

Selection and Training of Field Workers

Provincial offices of MOEC and Bappeda (Regional Planning Office) in Riau and Central Java were requested to identify research personnel, as interviewers are deliberately chosen from the sample provinces in an attempt to enhance local MOEC competence in research activities. This strategy also minimized transportation costs and language difficulties. Local staff were trained and supervised by Puslit-Balitbang Dikbud project staff.

Field Activities

Each researcher completed interviews and collected secondary data from schools in a sampled subdistrict (from 5-6 schools in 2-4 villages from a total of 72 respondents). During the first week data collection was carried out in a subdistrict of a municipality. This permitted for a period of guided data collection before researchers were dispatched to the more distant subdistricts where they would work alone. All data collection was completed by November 1989.

Even though research personnel were selected from their respective regions, local language-use caused difficulty. In several villages, staff were assisted by interpreters selected by local leaders.

Data Processing and Analysis

Data processing and analysis consisted of the following:
writing code books for each instrument and data collection form,
transferring data from answer sheets to coding sheets,
transferring data from coding sheets to computer file,
developing SPSS programs, and
statistical analyses consisting of univariate analysis, cross tabulation and correlation.

The project was not too successful in obtaining sufficient data on educational costs. Not all schools had complete data on the types and amounts of funds received and spent. The financial records of the BP3 were also incomplete (perhaps because most BP3s entrusted school headmasters to administer their funds). Most of the fiscal data reported contained only large units of expenditure, and since that was incomplete, it was regarded as invalid for use in drafting policy recommendation on unit costs.

A number of variables were collected as indicators of larger independent variables. For example, belongings (transportation, possessions, land, livestock, savings, etc.) were compounded to form a composite variable 'wealth.' And, 'wealth,' 'parents education level,' and 'availability of reading material in the home' were used as proxy measures of SES. The income variable was not included in SES. (Though a preliminary analysis indicated that among independent variables, parents educational background correlated highly with income. Throughout Indonesia, education is regarded as the most important determinant of one's social status.) In analyzing parents contributions, BP3 and SPP contributions were added to form a new variable 'school fee.' This was necessary for comparisons between private and public schools, and SDs and MIs because most the of private schools only have school fee, and that is technically neither an SPP nor a BP3 fee.

The 'daily allowance' variable is a composite of 'pocket money' and 'transport money' that is provided by parents. The 'process' variable is a composite of all additional daily (monthly/25) average funds paid by the student to the school. The total of 'SPP,' 'BP3,' 'process,' and 'daily' x 25 days became a new variable, 'monthly' that represents parents monthly education costs.

Bivariate and multivariate analyses of school expenses were not completed as most of the data on school fees contained little variation. Analysis is therefore focused on comparing costs on a school basis and among schools in their own subdistrict. Comparisons among subdistricts are seen from the trend of differences within the schools and subdistricts. However, zero order correlations among the variables were calculated and crosstabulations of some independent variables with monetary variables are made to describe the distribution trends.

4.0 FINDINGS

The total number of respondents was 1132 from 6 districts, 12 subdistrict, and 38 villages in Riau and Central Java. The sample consisted of 820 parents (of SD, MI and SMTP children), 144 local community leaders, 65 headmasters, 33 village heads, and 60 BP3 chairpersons.

General Description of Respondents

The number of parents in the sample was as follows: 426 from Central Java, and 394 from Riau. (Two were not included in the parents data analysis as they were included as community leaders.) Distribution by subdistrict is depicted in Table 1. The largest subdistrict representation was 72, the smallest 59. By sex, the students of interviewed parents were 49% male (Table 2).

The educational background of the majority of respondents was low, 65% have some formal education below the level of SMTP graduate; i.e., less than nine years of schooling (see Table 3). Their occupational backgrounds vary from the lowest, 'kuli' (part-time blue collar job) to manager in either business or government (Table 4). The major groupings are: civil and military service (23.6%), landowner farmers (17.5%), and self-employed or 'wiraswasta' (14%).

Forty-five percent of the respondents have more than 4 children, with the average number of children per family being 3.5 (see Table 5). The youngest respondent was 20, and the oldest 75; the parents of children from public primary schools (SD Negeri) were, on the whole, younger than other groups.

Based on socioeconomic-status (SES) (an aggregate index of variables based on wealth, education, reading materials, and savings), there is wide variation among the total sample. However, there is indication that the SES of respondents's MI, and private SMTPs (SMP Swasta) is lower than that of public SDs (SD Negeri) and public SMP (SMP Negeri) respondents (see Table 6).

Table 1

Sample by District, by Subdistrict, and Role

District	Subdistrict district	Parents				Vill. lead-ers	Head mast-ers	BP3 Chair pers.	Vill. heads	Total
		SDN	MI	SMPN	SMPS					
Cilacap	1.Kesugihan	23	12	11	22	18	6	4	4	98
	2.Gandr. Mangu	24	12	12	24	8	6	6	2	94
Kodya Semarang	3.Semarang Bt	24	12	24	12	12	6	6	2	98
	4.Semarang Tm	24	12	24	12	10	6	6	3	97
Karang Anyar	5.Tawangmangu	24	12	12	24	16	6	6	3	103
	6.Jaten	23	12	24	12	9	6	6	4	96
Kodya Pekanbaru	7.Limapuluh	24	–	24	12	3	4	4	3	74
	8.Sukajadi	20	4	20	12	12	3	4	2	77
Riau Kepulauan	9.Karimun	24	12	24	12	20	5	5	3	105
	10.Bintan Ut	35	–	36	–	8	6	6	3	95
Iindagiri Hilir	11.Tembilahan	24	11	24	12	16	6	6	4	103
	12.Keritang	24	12	12	12	16	5	5	2	83
Total	Parents and Leaders	293	111	248	166	144	65	60	35	1,132

Table 2

Sample by Sex of Student of Interviewed Parent

	Frequency	Percent
Male	402	49.1
Female	416	50.9
Total	818	100.0

Table 3
Parent Sample by Education Level

Education Level of Parent	School Attended by Child Pub. SD	MI	Pub. SMP	Pri. SMP
0–2 yrs SD	22 (7.7)	14 (13.7)	10 (4.1)	17 (10.9)
3–5 yrs SD	36 (12.5)	22 (21.6)	13 (5.4)	31 (19.9)
SD Grad	101 (35.2)	46 (45.1)	61 (25.2)	51 (32.7)
SMTP Grad	43 (15.0)	9 (8.8)	60 (24.8)	28 (17.9)
SMTA Grad	61 (21.3)	9 (8.8)	63 (26.0)	22 (14.1)
2/3 Yr Coll Grad	17 (5.9)	1 (1.0)	24 (9.9)	6 (3.8)
Sarjana/Master	7 (2.4)	1 (1.0)	11 (4.5)	1 (0.6)
Total	287 (100.0)	102 (100.0)	242 (99.9)	156 (99.9)

Table 4
Parent Sample by Occupation of Father

Occupation of Father	School Attended by Child Pub. SD	MI	Pub. SMP	Pri. SMP
Kuli	47 (16.0)	12 (10.8)	16 (6.5)	20 (12.0)
Factory Worker	29 (9.9)	11 (9.9)	31 (12.5)	25 (15.1)
Farmer Without Land	4 (4.8)	7 (6.3)	12 (4.8)	6 (3.6)
Farmer With Land	40 (13.7)	42 (37.8)	15 (6.0)	46 (27.7)
Self-Employed	44 (15.0)	16 (14.4)	37 (14.9)	18 (10.8)
Civil/Military	84 (28.7)	9 (8.1)	107 (43.1)	24 (14.5)
Managerial	8 (2.7)	2 (1.8)	6 (2.4)	9 (4.8)
Unclassified	27 (9.2)	12 (10.8)	24 (9.7)	19 (11.4)
Total	293 (100.0)	111 (100.1)	248 (99.9)	166 (99.9)

Table 5

Parent Sample by Family Size

Family Size	School Attended by Child			
	Pub. SD	MI	Pub. SMP	Pri. SMP
0–2 Children	45	10	18	20
	(5.4)	(9.0)	(7.3)	(12.0)
3–4 Children	142	39	114	3
	(48.5)	(35.1)	(46.0)	(38.0)
5–6 Children	71	33	66	50
	(24.2)	(29.7)	(26.6)	(30.1)
7 or over	35	29	50	33
	(11.9)	(26.1)	(20.1)	(22.9)
Total	293	111	248	166
	(100.0)	(99.9)	(100.0)	(100.0)

Table 6

Parent Sample by SES

SES of Parent (Scaled from 9–41)	School Attended by Child			
	Pub. SD	MI	Pub. SMP	Pri. SMP
9 – 20	115	70	57	73
	(39.2)	(63.0)	(23.3)	(44.2)
21 – 30	144	40	134	84
	(49.2)	(36.0)	(54.7)	(50.9)
31 – 41	34	1	44	8
	(11.6)	(0.9)	(22.0)	(6.0)
Total	293	111	245	165
	(100.0)	(99.9)	(100.0)	(100.1)

Table 7

School Fees (SPP + BP3) Paid

School Fees (SPP + BP3)	School Attended by Child Pub. SD	 MI	 Pub. SMP	 Pri. SMP
Rp. 0	1 (0.3)	7 (6.3)	0	0
Rp. 1 – 500	268 (91.4)	52 (46.8)	0	0
Rp. 501 – 1000	24 (8.2)	37 (33.3)	1 (0.4)	0
Rp. 1001 – 1750	0	14 (12.6)	63 (25.4)	0
Rp. 1751 – 2500	0	1 (0.9)	171 (69.0)	83 (50.0)
Rp. over 2500	0	0	13 (5.2)	83 (50.0)
Total	293 (99.9)	111 (99.8)	248 (100.0)	166 (100.0)

Description of Parents Contribution to Educational Costs

Types and Amounts of Monetary Contribution

Parents' contributions are defined in this study as those monies paid directly to school, BP3, teachers, student organization (OSIS) for the purpose of education of the student in the study, or money given directly to the student in the form of daily allowances. The contributions can be classified as routine and obligatory, incidental and voluntary, student daily allowances, and course entrance fees. It should be noted, however, that the costs of textbooks and writing materials were not included in the study.

a. Routine and Obligatory contributions

This category includes SPP fees at public SMTPs, BP3 fees at public SDs and public and private MIs, and the OSIS fee at SMTP. Most of the private SMPs do not have SPP and BP3 fees, rather they have one school fee. The size of these contributions are decided by the school according to provincial and district regulations, and should be paid by parents every month. In the analysis, the private SMPs school fees were treated as the equivalent of SPP fees.

The data revealed that there is almost no difference between the amount of SPP and BP3 fees paid by the parents of public school children (see Table 7). This is due to the fact that the SPP and BP3 scales used are developed for each subdistrict and are not related to ability to pay. However, across subdistricts it is very clear that the private schools' parents pay school fees (SPP and BP3 in the case of public SMP) that are much larger than those paid by public schools' parents (see Table 8). Parents in the remote areas (mountain areas, river banks, and small islands) in general pay smaller school fees (Table 9) than other parents. It is expected that this is because of their lower incomes.

In public SMPs the amount of SPP fee varies from Rp. 650 to Rp. 1,000, and the BP3 fee from Rp. 1,300 to Rp. 3,300. Or, the total school fee (SPP plus BP3) from between Rp. 2,000 to Rp. 4,000 per month. BP3 fee in SD and MI vary from Rp. 100 to Rp. 1,500. Parents in cities pay larger SPP and BP3 fees than those in rural areas. MI parents pay more than SD parents. However, if we take into account teachers salaries paid by government, it is usually the case that unit costs per student in public SMPs is higher than in the private SMPs.

b. Incidental and Voluntary Contributions

Included in this category are contributions paid by parents for the daily learning process; i.e., to buy materials for skill training, payments for sporting activities, school excursions, arts education, testing services, and school examination fees for the highest grade. With the exception of examination fees these have been collectively termed 'process' fees. All these fees are voluntary in the sense that they are governed by the student's wish or need to participate. These fees are usually paid directly to the respective teacher, and often no note of such contributions appears in the school bookkeeping. Also included in this category of fee are any additional cash contributions paid by parents toward the incidental needs of the school, BP3, and OSIS. The majority of parents of SD and MI children did not report paying any 'process' contributions. About half of both public and private SMP parents pay less than Rp. 250 per month in 'process' fees.

c. Daily Allowances

Two fees are included in this category, 'pocket money' and 'transport money.' These daily allowances vary from nothing at all to Rp. 3,700. Twenty-two percent of SD students and 34% of MI students go to school without a daily allowance. Fifty-two percent of private SMP and 64% of public SMP get between Rp. 50 and Rp. 250 per day.

d. School Entrance Fees

These fees are usually paid by new students when they enter the first grade of the school. Included in this fee may be a charge for enlisting at the school, a building contribution when the student is accepted, a school uniform fee, and an entrance examination fee. The building contribution is paid as an additional BP3 contribution per new student. Most schools ask the parents to pay on a credit basis over a three to six month period. According to the study parents may pay up to Rp. 100,000 in entrance fees.

Most of the public schools do not collect an enlisting fee, though most of the private schools do. The highest in the sample was Rp. 9,500. However, some public school parent reported that they pay a certain amount in the form of a combined enlisting and examination fee, even though this is against the law. Only a small number of schools, public or private collect uniform fees, and this is almost always collected from new students.

Adding all the contributions per month (excluding entrance fees), we arrive at the 'monthly' contribution figure. The data indicate that private school parents have a higher 'monthly' education cost than do corresponding public school parents.

According to school headmasters and BP3 chairpersons, the amount of BP3 and SPP is already at the maximum that parents can afford. This is true if that maximum is based on the regional fee scales, however if it is viewed from the perspective of parents' wealth, or ability to pay, the data from this study indicated that it is not the case. Data show that the income and SES of the parents varies a great deal, but as the amount of SPP and BP3 contributions are uniform this may be interpreted to show that because the parents with the highest income pay the same as those with low incomes, they could pay more. The question that is raised is not unique to Indonesia: Are poor families subsidizing the education of the children from more wealthy homes?

Table 8

SPP Fees Paid

SPP Fee	School Attended by Child			
	Pub. SD	MI	Pub. SMP	Pri. SMP
Rp. 0	293 (100.0)	111 (100.0)	1 (0.4)	0
Rp. 1 – 1750	0	0	247 (99.6)	0
Rp. 1750 – 3500	0	0	0	118 (71.1)
Rp. 3500 – 6000	0	0	0	48 (28.9)
Total	293 (100.0)	111 (100.0)	248 (100.0)	166 (100.0)

Table 9

Parents Education Expenses by Subdistrict (Rp.)

No.	KECAMATAN	SPP Fee A		BP3 Fee B		Total Fee A+B		(n)
		Mean	Std De	Mean	Std De	Mean	Std De	
1.	Kesugihan*	1438.2	1892.1	599.2	713.3	2037.5	1672.0	68
2.	Gandrungmangu	1160.4	1448.4	622.9	756.8	1783.3	1381.1	72
3.	Semarang Barat*	1302.7	2325.7	1580.5	1328.1	2883.3	2123.0	72
4.	Semarang Timur	1605.5	3020.2	1623.6	1256.3	3229.1	2890.3	72
5.	Jaten*	757.7	1183.1	1200.9	1376.6	1958.7	1699.6	71
6.	Tawang Mangu	950.0	1131.4	386.6	619.9	1336.6	1154.8	72
7.	Lima Puluh	2118.3	3310.6	1100.0	977.7	3218.3	3001.2	60
8.	Suka Jadi*	1303.5	1638.1	942.8	797.4	2246.4	1507.0	56
9.	Karimun	1240.2	2166.5	981.9	972.0	2222.2	2058.8	72
10.	Bintan Utara*	354.9	352.4	956.7	843.4	1311.6	1186.0	71
11.	Tembilahan*	816.6	1248.9	844.4	635.3	1661.1	1143.7	72
12.	Keritang	740.0	1171.8	580.0	557.4	1320.0	1086.8	60
	Total	1137.8	1909.0	956.5	949.9	2094.3	1847.5	818

Note: * Sample selected from the more developed areas.

Table 10

Frequency of Participation at School Events, per Year

Frequency of Attendance at Activities	School Attended by Child			
	Pub. SD	MI	Pub. SMP	Pri. SMP
0	68	23	47	35
	(23.2)	(20.7)	(19.0)	(21.1)
1 to 3	194	65	181	99
	(66.2)	(60.3)	(73.0)	(59.6)
Over 3	31	21	20	32
	(10.5)	(18.9)	(8.0)	(19.3)
Total	293	111	248	166
	(99.9)	(99.9)	(100.0)	(100.0)

Table 11

Income and Expenditure of Four Sampled Public SMPs (Rp. 000s)

Source of Funds	Schools SMPN 1 Tembilahan	 SMPN 2 Taw'mangu	 SMPN 4 Semerang	 SMPN 5 Pekanbaru
Income				
Total	16,442	19,737	50,524	16,421
1. Govt.	25.0%	–	–	–
2. BP3	56.5%	60.3%	69.4%	34.1%
3. ABRN	–	21.1%	20.7%	–
4. SPP	18.4%	18.5%	9.7%	27.9%
5. Other	–	–	–	–
Expenditures				
1. Learning Process	25.5%	36.2%	27.0%	37.9%
2. School Admin.	18.0%	12.7%	15.2%	27.9%
3. Maintenance	56.5%	12.8%	12.5%	34.1%
4. Welfare	–	19.3%	27.7%	–
5. Teaching Aids	–	18.9%	17.5%	–
6. Other	–	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%

Note: Teacher salaries (paid by GOI) not included.

Other Types of Parental Contribution

Only one-third of all parents reported that they ever contributed in any other way than the payment of fees.

Attendance at BP3 Meetings

Participation in BP3 meetings was reported as low. Only 31% of the parents attended meetings more than once (Table 10). An activity scale (that includes attendance at BP3 meetings) showed that only 13% of all parents participated in more than 3 events. There was a slight difference between the participation rates of private and public school parents; private school parents appear to be more active on the schools behalf.

Participation at BP3 and School Activities

In-depth interviews with headmasters, BP3 chairpersons, and community leaders revealed that those parents who most often participate in BP3 and school activities are those who are not the most wealthy.

However, they did report that those parents who have a better education and hold higher occupational positions tend to readily support the school. It appears that parents who are not currently active in BP3 meetings and/or do not contribute, generally do not do so because they are waiting for the headmaster or community leader to ask for their assistance.

A summary of the perceptions of parents' concerning the school and BP3, and of headmasters, teachers and BP3 chairpersons concerning parents and community participation are as follows:

- Sixteen percent of parents and 37% of community leaders evaluated school conditions (school cleanliness, furniture, and school equipment) as 'good.' The research team's observations of school facilities revealed that public SMPs tended to be better than private SMPs, and SDs tend to be better than the MIS.
- The BP3 role as a partner of the school was evaluated as 'good' by 73% of parents and community leaders. BP3's role as a fund raiser and representative of parents was evaluated 'good' by only 35% of parents and 50% of community leaders.
- Even though quite a number of respondents indicated that the regulation amount of BP3 and SPP contribution was sound and fair, 41% of parents indicated that the fees should be adjusted.
- According to headmasters and BP3 chairpersons, the success in increasing parental participation is through good public relations and regular meetings. However, one-third of the parents that attended the BP3 meetings thought that the BP3 leaders gave scant attention to members opinions.
- Headmasters and BP3 leaders expressed a belief that increased parental and community participations would come as a result of an increase in school quality.
- In terms of the roles of the school, parents, and community in educating students, the majority of parents (66%) indicated that the role of parents is one of helping the child to study at home, while the school is responsible for the teaching-learning process. The role of school's parent community is that of helping the students to appreciate their environment.
- Parental involvement in the classroom is very rare in Indonesia, and as a consequence it was not a surprise to see little support from headmasters and teachers for the mobilizing of parents to assist in classroom activities.

Community Contributions

Cash contributions from the school's parent community and its members is very rare. Two schools reported receiving contributions from the local business organizations. Village heads confirmed that villages contribute more in-kind than in cash; they donate land, furniture and equipment. One village head mentioned that an amount of money is given to the school to subsidize the use of part-time teachers. The researchers' observations in Riau's remote islands were that villages organize their communities to build housing for their primary school teachers.

Indications are, from most areas, that the community mechanism of '*gotong royong*' (self-help) in education which was strong before the First Pelita is now virtually nonexistent.

School Based Income Generating Activities (Swadaya Sekolah)

A small number of schools gain income from school based activities, though in each case the cash amounts raised were very small, and were used for teacher's welfare. The generation of income by the school is hindered by a MOEC regulation that bars schools from earning from activities, unless that income is submitted to the state treasury. Recent developments at MOEC seem to suggest that this policy may be eased to permit schools to have income generating activities, such as agricultural production units.

Management of Funds by Schools and the BP3

The financial data provided by school headmasters and BP3 chairpersons was far from complete. However, the existence of the School Budget Plan (RAPBS) for schools, though not widely used is an encouraging development. The use of the RAPBS by headmasters and BP3, if correctly supervised, will make both parties more accountable for their fiscal actions, and will, most importantly, provide a record of all the schools' financial transactions.

The survey data indicate that operational costs in public schools, including teachers salaries, come from central government and parents. Table 10 provides sample income and expenditure data from four public SMPs.

In the private schools, almost all operational costs are paid by the parents' contributions (school fees). The role of the private schools' Foundation Organization (Yayaysan) is marginal. It can be expressed with confidence that government will expect a larger role to be played by these foundations in the raising of educational funds in the future especially in relation to funding the universalization of junior high school.

In general, the management of school fees (SPP and BP3) is inadequate, and as a result it is rare that maximum use is made of scarce resources.

The study's findings, listed below, were drawn from discussions with headmasters, BP3 chairpersons and village leaders.

- BP3 funds are usually spent on school building maintenance, furniture, and furniture repair.
- SPP funds are not available for use by the school to respond to immediate needs, they are forwarded to GOI for redistribution to schools, and the amount received after that redistribution is decreasing.
- BP3 usually delegates the management of its funds to the school headmaster, who in turn usually delegates it to a teacher (some schools rotate the responsibility among teachers) so there is probably little structured use of funds.
- Schools and teachers lack the facility to obtain funds for additional operating costs. An SD regulation concerning free education is interpreted by parents to mean that they should be free of any obligation to pay for schooling other than non-teaching-learning activity fees.
- Many headmasters do not know how to spend funds wisely. They have received no training on fiscal management techniques.

Headmaster's Competencies

The absence of school management skills is evident and as such should be addressed by MOEC as soon as possible. It is thought that managerial skills are necessary especially as schools turn to their host community requesting increased participation in school resource provision. The most outstanding absence in this area is found at the primary school level, where virtually no school management training has been received by headmasters.

Concerning the need to increase competencies: Headmasters hoped that additional authority would be given them to organize activities in collaboration with extension units and other community based organizations. Their wish was to be able to make decisions concerning school fund raising activities, and to be given wider responsibilities to organize curricular activities that will allow them to introduce creative and innovative teaching-learning activities.

Home Visits

Sixty percent of the headmasters interviewed stated that they had made home visits during the last academic year. A review of the reasons for the home visits, however, did not reveal that the visits were a vehicle for developing a relationship between parents and the school. They were usually in response to a problem and were always formal. However, many parents reported that they did see the need for home visits by the school staff.

Potential Contributions from Parents and Communities

There are several other types of contribution that parents are willing to make that when combined would result in substantial community participation. These are: donated manpower (offered by 98% of parents and 96% of the community leaders), occasional cash donations (46% of parents, 54% of leaders), additional routine donations (7% parents and 17% leaders), and other types of contributions. Twenty-five percent of parents indicated their inability to contribute more money, though they could contribute working time (manpower). In line with expectations, those parents able to contribute more were those with secondary education or above, a relatively high income, and were already active in BP3 and other school activities.

The majority of parents and community leaders expressed the belief that if BP3 fees were increased the quality of the school and subsequent schooling would increase in turn.

Suggestions for Increasing Community Participation

Even though about half of the respondents, 44% to 54% of each group (parents, headmasters, BP3 chairpersons, and village heads) evaluated BP3 as being useful and necessary, and the management of BP3 funds as being open, they still asked that BP3 be more receptive to members needs (45% of the total sample). Headmasters, BP3 chairpersons, and village heads coupled this suggestion with the need for more information on the schools to reach parents. The belief was that these approaches would assist in improving the school's image in the community and, through that process, improve community participation.

Summary of Findings

Based on the descriptive and qualitative analysis of data collected in the provinces the following summary comments are made:

- Data concerning school funds that were collected from several sources was neither complete nor systematically kept by either schools or BP3 organizations.
- There is a substantial difference between the capacity of parents to pay school fees and the amount of SPP and/or BP3 fees that are requested of them. Usually all the parents from one school pay the same fees; i.e., low income parents pay the same amount as high income parents. In the private schools some of low income parents pay more than the wealthier parents who have children in public schools; this is true for all levels of schooling.
- The willingness of most parents and community leaders to give non-monetary contributions is not taken advantage of by either the schools or the BP3 organizations.
- Educational facilities which are funded by government mostly benefit the wealthier families.
- Parental participation in school activities (e.g., attending BP3 meetings) is limited, and the most prominent group that attends/participates is the better educated, wealthy parent that owns a means of transportation.
- The majority of the non-monetary contributions to either the school or the BP3 come from those less wealthy parents with little or no education.
- The willingness of parents to give contributions is determined by their assessment of the way that those contributions are managed, and by their perception of the effectiveness of past contributions in increasing childrens' education.
- There is a positive significant correlation between the parents' assessment of the school, their participation in BP3 meetings, and their willingness to contribute.
- Individual approaches to parents by headmasters, teachers, and community leaders are expected by most parents at all school levels. However, evidence does not indicate that this is a common practice.
- At the neighborhood and village community levels, joint activities in the context of community development are an effective approach to establishing ongoing community support.
- The headmaster as a figurehead has not yet become the motivating factor in increasing the quality and quantity of parental and community participation in school support activities. This is because they do not think that they have either the authority or the management competencies to take on those responsibilities.
- BP3 organizations are mostly dominated by the community's elite. Coupled with the "post-man" approach to communication, and a generally passive approach to encouraging additional parental activity this has resulted in the BP3 organizations being isolated from their members.
- Many BP3s delegate the management of the funds they raise to the school's headmaster, who in turn delegates it to a teacher. This appears to lessen the potential importance of the organization.
- Generally, BP3s limited their fund raising to approaching their own members (and the funds raised are usually used for building maintenance and furniture). Raising funds outside the membership is not a routine activity.

- In implementing NBE, the responsibilities of local units of MOEC will increase. For that purpose, additional authority and competencies need to be provided to headmasters and teachers.

5.0 POLICY ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy Issues

The study attempted to identify the various factors related to strengthening local education capacity in implementing NBE (SD and SMTP). Its primary concerns were the identification of potential means of both strengthening parent and community participation in activities to support and aid the school, and increasing parents' social commitment to their children's school.

Based on the study's findings, a number of policy related issues were identified:

- On the one hand MOEC needs additional operational funds to implement NBE and at the same time ensure that at the very least the current quality of education is not lessened. While on the other hand it is not realistic for MOEC to expect any substantial increase in the level of financial support from parents for school related activities.

  Firstly, because the capacity of parents to contribute is in most cases extremely limited, while the number of dependent children per family is quite large (over 4 children per family). Secondly, in "school fee-free" SDs and MIs it is politically difficult to encourage the introduction of financial contributions. And it is even more difficult in SD-Inpres schools, where parents consider everything free as part of the Inpres promise of the "Sekolah Presiden" (i.e., The President's School, all of which were built with GOI funds under Presidential Decree).

  Because of this situation, the expansion of education costs due to completing a compulsory NBE will most probably require a similar GOI mechanism to that adopted to finance the compulsory education (SD) movement. Government will be obliged to erect additional Sekolah Inpres and to free the "new" SMTP student from school fees – as it is difficult to demand compulsory education, and then to force people to pay for it in the form of direct fees. Therefore, it appears that government (central and/or local) must increase their allocations to the education budget. From one perspective, such an increase is logical, since the expansion of NBE is the will of government, and not the expressed will of the people. Though, another point of view is that there must be a more directed effort to enhance parental and societal participation in education support activities as the Broad Outlines of State Policies (GBHN) clearly articulates that the responsibility of education lies in the hands of government, parents and community.

  If the GOI policy toward universalization of NBE follows the same pattern as the universalization of SD, then it is to be expected that familiar problems will arise in its implementation, (e.g., the difficulty of collecting fees from parents and communities through the schools). If fund-raising through BP3 is to continue then the management of school finances and BP3 fees must be made into an accountable action. Headmasters and teachers should be released from administering BP3 fees, and the BP3 organization, and its members, given the opportunity to participate more actively in the schooling process. The spending of BP3 funds through the Yearly School Budget may be a suitable mechanism for this practice.

- Most schools usually experience difficulties in their administrative procedures (DPP) concerning the drawing of school fees (SPP); i.e., SPP fees cannot be directly spent by the school. The study also revealed that the determination of the amount of school fee and BP3 fee is not equitable if the fee levied is considered from a socioeconomic perspective. There is no difference in the amount of SPP and BP3 fees paid by those parents from high or low SES backgrounds, nor is there any differentiation between the fees paid by parents with one or seven children

If the school fees at the SMTP level are required for the NBE program to be successful, then MOEC must institute regulations that alleviate what may be impossible fiscal pressures on some families.

For fees to be equitable for all schools, a regulation could introduce some degree of either matched funding between GOI and parent communities, or a per-pupil allowance from GOI, per school, that was reflective of some subprovince economic allocation ratio or control measure.

- In addition, it is critical that local government be permitted to raise funds for education. GOI policies should more clearly express the role of the levels of local government in relation to the use of education monies from a societal source (e.g., land and house tax (PBB)).
- The analysis of the data collected in this study revealed that the level of parental and societal participation in the implementation of educational activities at a school is determined by local perceptions of the capability of the headmaster, social leaders and teachers to establish a community centered relationship with the school's host community. Many parents are waiting for a request to provide support to education, but there is little evidence that they will support an institution that does not hold the promise of functioning at what they regard as a near optimal level both from a management and curricula perspective.
- The study also revealed that the effective implementation of NBE will require some delegation of authority from the central units of MOEC down to the school level. A system of management and micro-planning (school based planning) should therefore be given serious consideration. However, it is recognized that a change in this direction will require a large revision of existing regulations and management mechanisms at all levels. Without such changes, indications are that central MOEC will be grossly overburdened and, as a consequence, unable to manage the NBE implementation process.

Recommendations

The outcomes of the analysis of SLEC data in Phase I and Phase II of the study, and a review of other references from Puslit in particular, and Balitbang Dikbud in general, cause the SLEC research team to recommend the following policy directions:

1. Strengthening the local MOEC capacity to implement NBE
   a. A deconcentration rather than a decentralization of authority from MOEC central units to MOEC local units.
   b. Rather than a centrally based enhancement of fund-raising activities, but rather the authority for provinces, districts, subdistricts and the schools themselves to determine their fund-raising and community support strategies.
2. Strengthening Local Education Capacity
   a. The strengthening of community participation in education should start with a building of their confidence in school management and teaching. This should be approached through the enhancement of headmasters' and teachers' competencies in their respective responsibilities.

   Included are:

- Teachers' competency as a liaison personnel between schools and parents.
- Headmasters' ability to manage the school.
- Headmasters' and teachers' competencies to evaluate both attitudes and values.
- Headmasters' and teachers' competencies in utilizing out-of-school resources for planning and school management.
- Headmasters and teachers' competencies to work toward an enhancement of school quality (as perceived by the parent community).
- Teacher's competency in mobilizing parents as resource persons in the classroom and in out-of-school activities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

b. The strengthening of parental and general community participation should be approached formally and informally through recognized social leaders.

c. The management of education finances should be modified to permit schools:

   1. wider authority to spend the funds that originate from their parents and community, and to account for their fiscal activity through the School Yearly Budget Plan,

   2. to determine, under regulated advisement, the amount of parental contributions (school fees) required, and

   3. authority to raise additional funds through school sponsored activities.

d. Because of the importance of basic education for nation building, its primary budget should be borne by GOI. The calculation of GOI support should be based on unit costs per school, in terms of per student, per program. The unit costs per student, per program should be the same from school to school (within certain guidelines) and a per-pupil minimum should be provided by GOI to be matched in some way by funds from school based sources.

e. Even though the existence of private schools is permitted under Education Law No. 2/1989, recognition should be given to those having 50% permanent staff that are paid by the institution.

f. In order to be effective and efficient, school planning should be based on a bottom-up approach (i.e., per school unit).

In short, the implementation of the study's recommendations will permit headmasters and teachers to manage the schools in a professional and competent manner by:

- the enhancement of headmasters, teachers, and local units of MOEC; and
- the additional delegation of authority to schools and local units of MOEC to carrying out functions such as the fund-raising and using the funds raised.

Recommendations for Further Research

Many aspects of community participation still need to be studied. Important aspects to be studied are:

1. The impact of the various cultural based expectations; re: the role of the community in supporting education.
2. In-depth studies on real parent expenses in the various communities of Indonesia.
3. The development of models that test a number of mechanisms designed to enhance community capacity and willingness to support education.

Attachment: Interview Schedule

SLEC Indonesia

INTERVIEW GUIDE
PARENTS

Name of Interviewer: ______________________________

Date of Interview: _____/_____/_____

Checked by: ______________________________

Number of Respondent: ____/____/____/____/

Student Name: ______________________________

Name of School: ______________________________

Location (Address): ______________________________

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Jakarta, July 1988

1. Respondent ID #:_____/_____/_____/_____/

2. Location:

a. Province:

☐ 1 Jawa Tengah
☐ 2 Riau

b. District:

☐ 1 Cilacap
☐ 2 Semarang
☐ 3 Karang Anyar
☐ 4 Palembang
☐ 5 Riau Kepulauan
☐ 6 Indragiri Hilir

c. Subdistrict:

☐ 1 Kesugihan
☐ 2 Gandrungmangu
☐ 3 Semarang Barat
☐ 4 Semarang Timur
☐ 5 Jaten
☐ 6 Tawangmangu
☐ 7 Pekanbaru
☐ 8 Riau Kepulauan
☐ 9 Indragiri Hilir
☐ 10 Pekanbaru Kota
☐ 11 Sukajadi
☐ 12 Karimun
☐ 13 Bintan Utara
☐ 14 Tembilahan
☐ 15 Keritang

d. Village Name:____

3. School Identity:

a. Number of School:________/________/

b. Type of School:

☐ 1 SD (Public)
☐ 2 SD (Private)
☐ 3 MI (Public)
☐ 4 MI (Private)
☐ 5 SMP (Public)
☐ 6 SMP (Private)

4. Student Identity:

a. Sex of Student:

☐ 1 Female
☐ 2 Male

b. Class:

☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ 5
☐ 6

5. Respondent:

☐ 1 Father
☐ 2 Mother
☐ 3 Both parents
☐ 4 Other, please specify:____

6. a. Father Age: ________years

b. Mother Age: ________years

7. How long have you been staying in this Village?

☐ 1 ‹1 year
☐ 2 1-5 years
☐ 3 6-10 years
☐ 4 ›10 years

8. Total number of children:

☐ 1 Attending Primary School: __________
☐ 2 Attending Junior Secondary School: __________
☐ 3 Attending Senior Secondary School: __________
☐ 4 Attending M.I.: __________
☐ 5 Already working: __________
☐ 6 Not yet attending school: __________

9. a. Occupation of Parents:

Father:	Mother:
☐ 1	☐ 1 Contract Farmer
☐ 2	☐ 2 Farmer
☐ 3	☐ 3 Farm Worker
☐ 4	☐ 4 Public/civil employee
☐ 5	☐ 5 Armed forces
☐ 6	☐ 6 Private employee
☐ 7	☐ 7 Village official
☐ 8	☐ 8 Governmental Official
☐ 9	☐ 9 Business/Industry Official
☐ 10	☐ 10 Permanent worker (non-industrial)
☐ 11	☐ 11 Part-time worker (non-industrial)
☐ 12	☐ 12 Rural entrepreneur (self-employed)
☐ 13	☐ 13 Urban entrepreneur (self employed)
☐ 14	☐ 14 Housewife
☐ 15	☐ 15 Others (specify):____________________
☐ 16	☐ 16 Unemployed

b. Leadership position in community:____________________

10. Highest level of education completed:

a. Formal:

☐ 1 No education (illiterate)
☐ 2 Dropout SD Grade 1-2
☐ 3 Dropout SD Grade 3-6
☐ 4 Literacy certificate
☐ 5 Primary School Graduate
☐ 6 Dropout Junior Secondary School
☐ 7 Junior Secondary School Graduate
☐ 8 Senior Secondary School Drop-out
☐ 9 Senior Secondary School Graduate
☐ 10 Primary School Teacher Training College (equivalent to Senior Secondary Level)
☐ 11 Junior Secondary School Teacher Training College (Senior Secondary School + two year)
☐ 12 D I/D II Diploma
☐ 13 Bachelor/D III
☐ 14 Four-year college (S1)
☐ 15 Master (S2)
☐ 16 Ph.D (S3)
☐ 17 Others: ______________________________

b. Have you ever attended a vocational training institution?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

11. The other social economic status of the respondents family:

a. Housing:

1) House condition/quality:

☐ 1 Emergency
☐ 2 Semipermanent building
☐ 3 Permanent building
☐ 4 Luxurious building

2) House architecture:

☐ 1 Modern
☐ 2 Traditional
☐ 3 Great traditional

3) Number of rooms:__________

4) Water Closet:

☐ 1 Indoor
☐ 2 Outdoor
☐ 3 Outdoor (sharing with neighbor)
☐ 4 Outdoor (river/paddy fields)

5) Ownership:

☐ 1 Relative (stay with them)
☐ 2 Borrow
☐ 3 Parents'
☐ 4 Office
☐ 5 Rent
☐ 6 Perumnas/BTN (credit house)
☐ 7 Self-owned

6) Distance from Public Health Center (kms):__________________

b. Items, animals, and other belongings (please specify the number or size of the belongings at right.):

☐ 1 Radio______________________________
☐ 2 Tape Recorder______________________________
☐ 3 Radio-tape ______________________________
☐ 4 Black & White TV______________________________
☐ 5 Color TV______________________________
☐ 6 Video______________________________
☐ 7 Bicycle______________________________
☐ 8 Beca (Three-cycle)______________________________
☐ 9 Motorcycle ______________________________
☐ 10 Horse cart ______________________________
☐ 11 Motorcar ______________________________
☐ 12 Refrigerator______________________________
☐ 13 Rice field ______________________________
☐ 14 Dry Farmland______________________________
☐ 15 Fish-pond ______________________________
☐ 16 Chickens ______________________________
☐ 17 Goats ______________________________
☐ 18 Cows/Karabu______________________________
☐ 19 Gold/jewelry______________________________
☐ 20 Other ______________________________
☐ 21 Other ______________________________

c. Do you:

1. Subscribe to a newspaper	☐ 1 Yes	☐ 2 No
2. Subscribe to magazine(s)	☐ 1 Yes	☐ 2 No
3. Have a home library	☐ 1 Yes	☐ 2 No
4. Have a savings account	☐ 1 Yes	☐ 2 No
5. Have savings at home	☐ 1 Yes	☐ 2 No

12. a. How much is your average monthly income?

Rp________________________

b. When do you receive it?

☐ 1 Each day
☐ 2 Each week
☐ 3 Each fortnight
☐ 4 Each month
☐ 5 Irregular

13. Have you ever given a contribution for education through your village? If yes, what form and how much is it?

☐ 1 There was never any request
☐ 2 Never give it even though there is a request
☐ 3 Yes, in farms:______________________________________
member:______________________________________

14. a. Have you gone away from this village around twenty kilometers or farther?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 Not yet

b. If yes, generally did you go alone or together with your family?

☐ 1 Alone
☐ 2 With my spouse
☐ 3 With my children
☐ 4 With all my family

c. What for did you generally go away?

☐ 1 Trading
☐ 2 Business
☐ 3 Recreation
☐ 4 To visit relatives
☐ 5 ____________________________________

15. This questions relates only to the child who is named on the cover page, and concerned with his/her school fees. In 1987/1988, what fees and how much have you spent for the school expenses of your child?

a. Type of expenses	Amount	Ways of payment
1. Enrollment fee	Rp_______	1 2 3 4 *
2. Entrance exams fee	Rp_______	1 2 3 4
3. Building fee	Rp_______	1 2 3 4
4. Uniform fee	Rp_______	1 2 3 4
5. _____________ fee	Rp_______	1 2 3 4

* Note:
1. Cash payment at school admittance
2. 10 month installments
3. Payment during First Quarter/Semester
4. Payment at every quarter/semester

b. Type of monthly expenses:

School fee (SPP): Rp__________
BP3 fee: Rp__________
Test fee: Rp__________
EBTA/EBTANAS fee: Rp__________
OSIS fee/contribution: Rp__________
Pre-vocational/skill training fee/contribution: Rp__________
Physical Education fee/contribution: Rp__________
Art education fee: Rp__________
Field-trip fee: Rp__________
Others: Rp__________
Total: Rp__________

c. Type of daily expenses:

1) Pocket money: Rp__________
2) Transport expenses: Rp__________
Total: Rp__________

16. Other than contributing money, have you donated any Labor or other items to the school?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

If yes, please specify what contribution you have given to the school and for what purpose?

Type of contribution	for activity/purpose
1.______________________	1.______________________
2.______________________	2.______________________
3.______________________	3.______________________

17. a. (This question is only for SMP Parents) Do you consider the SPP fees you are charged by the school reasonable?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

b. If no, why not? Please specify.

____
____
____

18. a. Is the BP3 fee that you pay reasonable?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

b. If no, why not? Please specify.

____
____
____

19. a. If BP3 fees were increased do you feel that there would be any noticeable changes at the school?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

b. If yes, what do you think those changes would be? Please specify.

____
____
____

20. Who determines the amount of BP3 fees in this school?

☐ 1 I don't know
☐ 2 BP3 board member
☐ 3 BP3 board member and individual parents
☐ 4 The headmaster
☐ 5 Consensus arrived at by the BP3 membership
☐ 6 Other, please specify________________________

21. a. Do you know of any regulation that determines the maximum fees that your child's school can charge?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

b. If yes, do you consider the regulation fair?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

c. If the regulation is unfair, why is this so? Please specify.

____

____

____

22. a. How many times did the PTA meet in the 1987/1988 school year?

☐ 1 Don't know
☐ 2 Never
☐ 3 One times
☐ 4 Two times
☐ 5 Three times
☐ 6 More than three times

b. Have you, or your spouse, ever attended PTA meetings?

☐ 1 No, because I don't know
☐ 2 Never, even though I know
☐ 3 One times
☐ 4 Two times
☐ 5 Three times
☐ 6 More than three times

c. In the meeting where you attended, how do you evaluate the input of parents such as yourself?

☐ 1 Our input is always taken into consideration
☐ 2 Our input is usually taken into consideration
☐ 3 Our input is often taken into consideration
☐ 4 Our input is never taken into consideration
☐ 5 __________________________

d. If you do not attend PTA meetings, why not?

☐ 1 Do not have time
☐ 2 Have no interest
☐ 3 Do not hear about them
☐ 4 It would make no difference if I (we) did attend
☐ 5 Other reason, please specify: ____________________

23. How would you consider to be the function of the PTA?

☐ 1 To raise PTA funds
☐ 2 To assist the school
☐ 3 To represent the parents at the school
☐ 4 Other function, please specify:____________________

24. a. Is the BP3 performing its functions, as you see them, well?

☐ 1 Fully
☐ 2 Mostly
☐ 3 Partly
☐ 4 A little

b. If not fully what could the BP3 do better to serve the interests of the school? Please specify?

25. a. Do you think that the community could do more to support the school your child attends?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

b. If yes, what could be done? Please specify.

c. If no, could you specify the reason?

26. What could your family do to further support your child's school?

☐ 1 Contribute more funds occasionally
☐ 2 Contribute more funds regularly
  Rp ____________ per
  ☐ 1 Month
  ☐ 2 Quarter
  ☐ 3 Semester
  ☐ 4 Year
☐ 3 Contribute Labor, in forms of ____________
☐ 4 Contribute material/equipments, in forms of ____________
☐ 5 Contribute ____________
☐ 6 We could do nothing else.

Additional comments, if given.

27. a. Have you, or your spouse, provided any of the following forms of assistance (personal involvement) to the school?

1. Help in school renovation	☐ 1 Yes	☐ 2 No
2. Help in extracurricular activities	☐ 1 Yes	☐ 2 No
3. Help by assisting teachers in the classroom	☐ 1 Yes	☐ 2 No
4. Other, please specify: ____________		

b. If you have assisted the schools, what caused you to help?

☐ 1 Because the BP3 requested my (our) help
☐ 2 Because leader/headmaster/school requested help
☐ 3 Because my (our) child requested it
☐ 4 Because I saw that the school needed help
☐ 5 Other reason, please specify: ____________

c. If you have not assisted the school, could you indicate why:

☐ 1 Was not asked – would not help if asked
☐ 2 Was not asked – would help if asked
☐ 3 Have already contributed enough
☐ 4 Have no time to contribute my help
☐ 5 Nothing needs to be assisted
☐ 6 Other reason, please specify: ____________

28. How would you rate the following facilities at your children(s) schools?

	Good	Adequate	Unsatisfactory	Don't know
a. Building	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
b. Desks and chairs	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
c. Teaching material	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
d. Cleanliness	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4

29. a. Has your home been visited by either the headmaster or teacher this year?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

b. If yes, what was the purpose?

☐ 1 To know the condition of my child
☐ 2 To discuss my child's problems at school
☐ 3 To ask information on my family's condition
☐ 4 To enquire about the school fee
☐ 5 Social visit
☐ 6 Other reason, please specify: ______________________________
____

c. Do you think that the teacher or headmaster should visit your home?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 Yes, only for specific reason
☐ 3 No
☐ 4 Don't know

d. Please explain why.

____
____
____

30. In your opinion, how can we make BP3 in this school and others become a better institution and be more beneficial to the school?

a. ____
____
____

b. ____
____
____

31. What should be done by the BP3 so that parents will participate more actively in the school's activities?

☐ 1 BP3 board should pay more attention to its members' interests
☐ 2 BP3 board should manage its finance more openly
☐ 3 School principal should give a direction or advice on managing the finance
☐ 4 ______________________________

32. Do you have a suggestion as to how the school and/or BP3 can cooperate to improve the school?

____
____
____

33. Do you have any other suggestions as to how the parents and community in this area can help in promoting school quality?

____
____
____